THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE THEOLOGY OF YVES CONGAR.

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ELIZABETH M. KEARNEY.

DEPARTMENT OF THEOLOGY AND CHURCH HISTORY

FACULTY OF DIVINITY

SEPTEMBER 1994

ABSTRACT.

After an introduction including biographical and contextual details, Chapter One of this thesis considers the theological influences on Congar and the approach which this writer takes to theology.

Chapter Two outlines the areas with which the thesis is particularly concerned and indicates the problems raised which a pneumatological concern might help solve.

In Chapter Three Congar's treatment of doctrine of the Holy Spirit is examined, since it is argued throughout that he connects his understanding of who the Spirit is with the role he plays in other areas of theology.

In Chapter Four Congar's pneumatological approach to Christology is considered and it is argued that as he involves the Spirit in the Christ event, he ensures that his Christology is biblical, truly Trinitarian, incorporates the eschatological dimension and clarifies the way God brings about our redemption through His Word and His Spirit.

Chapter Five considers Congar's view of the human person especially as he or she is made in the image of God, and argues that he provides an approach to theological anthropology which, by incorporating the Spirit, emphasises the personal in our relationship with God, illuminates our understanding of how this works in our lives, and helps us grasp the logic of Christ's salvific work in us.

Chapter Six sets out Congar's understanding of Church as both institution and community of salvation and argues that as his increasingly pneumatological vision leads to his seeing the Church as a communion, co-instituted by the Spirit who makes her one, holy, catholic and apostolic he provides us with an important theological foundation for many important existential developments which affect not only the Roman Catholic Church and her members, but also her relations with other Churches.

Chapter Seven sets out Congar's views on the Spirit in the Church and argues that God is still working in the living Church keeping her true to her foundation yet ever new in the way God always works with His creation, through His Spirit.

This thesis contributes to the knowledge of Congar's theology by looking at it as a whole, ultimately understood as unified by being regarded from a pneumatological perspective.

TABLE OF CONTENTS.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to thank my supervisor, Professor George Newlands, for his help and patience, Professor John Zizioulas who introduced me to the work of Yves Congar, Mrs Marion Paton who endeavoured to make me computer literate, Ms. Elspeth Attwool for her advice and encouragement and especially my husband without whose support this thesis would never have been completed.

INTRODUCTION.

In this thesis I propose to examine the pneumatology of Yves Congar. Pneumatology is a subject which has been given a higher profile in the Western Churches in recent years after a period of eclipse and in Congar is found a theologian who, towards the end of a long career devoted largely to the study of ecclesiology and in pursuit of good ecumenical relations, produces a three volume work on the Holy Spirit. This man, who has said that he has never had a plan, that his theology has developed in response to circumstances and appeals, [Congar 1981, 405] has been led to a lengthy consideration of the Third Person of the Trinity, his being and function.

Scripture testifies to the preaching of the Kingdom of God carried out by Jesus of Nazareth but it does not stop there. It is witness to the fact that this same Jesus who proclaimed the coming of his Father's Kingdom, was himself believed in and acclaimed as the Christ, the definitive coming of God to His creation, the one through whom all would be brought into a new filial relationship with the Father. It sets out also the presence, and takes account of the action, of the Spirit in the mission of Jesus as the one sent by the Father so that all might have access to Him. Revelation binds us, therefore to the view that a theology which does not deal seriously and comprehensively with the revealed third person of the Trinity, is a defective theology. Yet it is this area, of the person and role of the Holy Spirit, which many theologians consider has not been studied in such a way as to develop a comprehensive theology . Kilian McDonnell quotes St. Augustine as saying that "Wise and spiritual men have written numerous books on the Father and the Son....On the contrary the Holy Spirit has not yet been studied so extensively and with like care ." [McDonnell 1985,191.] Little had changed by the time of the Second Vatican Council. Walter Kasper says

> Pneumatology is an area largely abandoned by Catholic theology. Non-Catholic observers have reproached the very texts of the Vatican Council for reflecting an excessive Christomonism and for having neglected the pneumatological dimension. According to them the Spirit is present only as a simple function of Christ; he is spoken of as one who ensures that the words and works of Christ achieve their universal completion and can be interiorly assimilated by the individual subject. [Kasper 1976,48]

Certain Orthodox theologians have blamed this perceived lack of pneumatology for much of the discord between the Churches of East and West. [Lossky 1958.] That there was such an attitude would seem to be confirmed by elementary text- books such as the 1960 edition of Apologetics and Catholic Doctrine the index of which says, as its only entry on the subject, "Holy Spirit, the gifts of, see under Confirmation." [Sheehan 1960, 305] The same book is largely made up of chapters framed in Christological terms - " Jesus Christ claimed to be God ", "Jesus Christ founded a Church", "The characteristics of the Church founded by Jesus Christ." Yves Congar quotes Nikos Nissiotos as reproaching the Latins for their Christomonism in the following terms -

> The Latins tend to make the Holy Spirit a simple function of Christ; his the task of personalising salvation...of assuring the harmony of ecclesial life, its development, its fidelity to its origins by institutional and personal charisms; in short, the task of making effective in the Church, the work of Christ.[Congar,1970,41]

Abstracting from the question of whether the pneumatology of the Orthodox Church is itself without problems - John Zizioulas suggests that East and West need to work together to achieve a full and organic synthesis of Christology and Pneumatology [Zizioulas 1985,126.] - it is debatable whether Western thought is as christomonistic as claimed. Yves Congar took up the challenge presented by the critics in articles where he aims to show that the Holy Spirit is not as absent in Catholic theology as it has been suggested [La Pneumatologie dans la théologie catholique, Pneumatologie ou Christomonisme dans la tradition Latine] and Lumen Gentium - with the drafting of which Father Congar was involved - itself illustrates the intention of the Council Fathers to re-emphasise the Trinitarian basis of salvation. Though it cannot be denied that the relationship of the Church to the Spirit , as opposed to its relationship to the Father and the Son, is not dealt with in detail, there is no doubt that Vatican II and its aftermath brought the problems of Pneumatology to the forefront of theology.

Congar's theology will be explored in this thesis, a task by its nature largely descriptive in character, and it will be argued that not only does an increasing pneumatological element in his theology shed light on the problems thrown up

by theological investigation and allow the drawing of interesting practical conclusions, it also provides a unifying factor giving Congar's theology added coherence and suggesting that pneumatology is a helpful 'category' for use in interpreting theological data. It is the intention to show that in his mature theology Congar looks at theology from a new view-point, that of the Spirit.

It is suggested that certain principles in Father Congar's orientation predisposed him to finding in pneumatology a satisfactory point of entry to and principle of explanation in many areas of theology. For Congar theology is not simply an abstract discipline but a lived experience rooted in his personal faith and his vocation as a member of the Order of Friars Preachers. He has a strong conviction that all is given by God together with an equally strong sense of the importance of the human being as having such a role in his development that it could almost be called 'con-causality' with God. Anyone convinced of the truth of both these elements is faced with a particular dilemma when trying to resolve the tension generated when one attempts to relate the human to the divine, and this in all areas of theology. Thus Congar must consider the relationship between truth as a 'given' and its expression in the Church, he must pay attention to history as the time in which the human co-operation with God takes place and develop a theological anthropology which accepts the gratuity of grace yet respects the nature of the human person as a being with freedom. In Christology he has a particular need to relate the humanity of Christ to his salvific work, that is to give the human life of Christ its full worth, and in ecclesiology he has the need to integrate the divine given with the contribution of the members of the Church. The argument which follows will attempt to demonstrate how Congar finds an increasing use of pneumatology helpful in solving the problems of areas such as these.

In order to decide whether Father Congar does provide a mature theology of the Spirit it will be necessary to consider how he deals with the doctrine of the Third Person in the Trinity as revealed in Scripture and Tradition in the areas of Christology, Anthropology and Ecclesiology to discover if the work of the Spirit is seen as integral to and synthesised with the work of the Father and the Son. This will entail consideration of how the Spirit is involved with the Incarnate Word and his work including the relative contributions of Christology and Pneumatology to Ecclesiology. It will be necessary also to decide whether a better understanding of our relationship with God, through grace and sacrament, not just as isolated individuals but also as members of a

Church, is obtained when pneumatology is incorporated into theology. Pneumatology cannot be studied in isolation but as part of the whole theological enterprise The conclusions reached in one area will inevitably affect other areas.

In this thesis the titles of books and articles are underlined in the text and italicised in the Bibliography.

1. Congar, the Man .

Yves Congar was born on the thirteenth of May 1904 in France. He describes himself as 'a Celt from the Ardennes', deeply rooted in his native soil and having a taste for history.[Puyo 1975, 6.] As a child he had Protestant and Jewish friends, each pursuing his own religion, and he remembers having theological discussions. He lived through the German occupation of his home town, Sedan, where life centred round the parish as the place where community life could express itself. He was deeply impressed when, the Catholic church having been destroyed, the Pastor offered to the local Catholics the use of a Protestant chapel which served the parish for six years. He feels that his ecumenical vocation must have something to do with this experience.[Congar 1964, xii]

In 1921 he began his training for the priesthood at the Seminaire des Carmes in Paris and from there attended lectures at the Institut Catholique.As a seminarian he also had to do military service and it was while so doing that he came into contact with the Benedictines at Conques, near Herbemont and at St. Hildegard in the Rhineland. Though their liturgy had an important formative effect it was the Dominican order which he entered on finishing his military service.

After his noviciate he entered the House of Studies at Le Saulchoir and was ordained a priest in 1930. Thereafter the young priest taught at Le Saulchoir where, in the course of preparing lectures on introductory theology, (which were to form the basis for La Foi et La Théologie published in 1962) he looked into the work of the Modernists including Loisy's Mémoires which had just appeared. This experience formed in him the strong conviction that he and his generation should bring together in the Church all that was good in what the Modernists set out, for example critical techniques and the importance of the point of view of the subject. [Jossua 1968, 21] In connection with the latter Congar discovered the work of Maurice Blondel and he was to tell Jean Puyo that though he came late to this philosopher, the more he read the more he appreciated his thought.

The main focus for Congar's attention was, however, ecclesiology and ecumenical relations. In his desire for Church unity he visited Germany in 1930 and 1931 to study Protestantism and there he first realised the depth of Luther's thought. He quotes what he wrote at the time, "My God , if only your Church were more encouraging, more comprehensive, all the same..enlarge

our hearts. Grant that men may understand us and we may understand men, all men. [Congar 1964, xv]

Because of his real sympathy with Protestantism he wanted to remove the misconceptions harboured about Catholics which prevented Protestants from really seeing the true face of the Catholic Church and perpetuated among Catholics a false idea of the Reformation and Protestantism. Since the first step in any irenic approach is authentic information, he arranged for the publication in La Vie Intellectuelle, sections on Protestantism which were issued separately as Cahiers pour la Protestantisme. As well as these contacts with Protestants, which continued in Paris, he also came into contact with the Franco-Russian circle which included Orthodox as well.

He continued teaching, attending ecumenical gatherings, carrying out the work for Christian unity, though this was not looked upon with universal approval, and in 1937 brought out Chrétiens désunis. Principes d'un Oecuménisme Catholique which had a profound influence though it caused him trouble with his superiors. [Congar 1964, p.xxxix] His work went on until the Second World War in which he was first a military chaplain and then a prisoner of war in Colditz. There he found, to his dismay, that ordinary men harboured in the main, an attitude of distrust and revulsion towards Rome. There also he heard with sadness and disbelief of the condemnation, in the person of Father Chenu, of the attitude to theology of Le Saulchoir. He himself escaped because he was out of circulation but he felt that the ground beneath his feet had been shaken. [Congar 1964, xl]

After the war there was more opposition to his ecumenical work and he was warned against false irenicism and had to endure years of suspicion and restriction during which he produced Le mystère du Temple, vraie et fausse réforme dans L'Église and Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat, among others.

It was the papacy of John XXIII which ended the long years for which 'active patience' was needed. Congar was appointed a consultor to the preparatory commission for the Second Vatican Council, and at the Council itself he worked on many of the major documents. He tells us that all the things in which he was interested came to fruition there, ecclesiology, ecumenism, reform of the Church, the lay state. " I was filled to overflowing" [Congar 1981,405]

During the Council he wrote Tradition and Traditions and in it can be discerned the beginning of a movement away from a pre-dominantly Christ centred Church to one in which the Spirit is also important. In 1979-80 he

produced I Believe in the Holy Spirit which Aidan Nichols describes as " a full-scale pneumatology".

2. Congar in context.

When one sets out to examine the work of a theologian the task must be undertaken in stages; the first of these is an examination of the milieu which gave birth to the theology concerned. This entails mapping out the spiritual and philosophical landscape in which the theology is situated, considering the springs which nourished it and the sources from which it derived its object and its method - what might be called the context of the work.
Father Congar began his studies for the priesthood at a time when the Modernist crisis, the culmination of Catholic liberal thinking, was over, as was the repressive anti-Modernist movement. As a result there existed a climate more conducive to theological research. This research, however could not but be affected by what had gone before.
The nineteenth century was, for Catholic theology, a time of renewal coming after the reactionary conservatism of the Counter Reformation and the challenge thrown down by the Enlightenment. The first half of that century was a time when Roman Catholic thought was brought into contact with the Romantic movement and engaged in dialogue with the main cultural and philosophical movements of the time.

2aRenewal from Romanticism.

The Romantic movement, which permeated literature, art, music and science as well as religion and theology in the period roughly from 1770-1840, is the reaction to the rationalism and orderliness of the Enlightenment. It brought new ideas of the self, of feeling, insight, intuition and freedom.

> Romanticism stands over against a world which the Enlightenment robbed of its magic: the marvellous, the healing powers of the depths, feeling, awe, the unconscious...the opposite of what is reasonable, lucid and orderly, rational.[O'Meara,1982,8.]

It was a movement which looked to the past beyond the Enlightenment, to nature and the marvels of its process and inter-connectedness, to mysticism

and to the person as a feeling subject, and it was to influence Roman Catholic theology.

> Its [Romanticism's] action promotes unity and the reintegration of the elements dissociated in the preceding period. It regains first of all a sense of the past, of the Fathers and even of Scholasticism, through its interest in the Middle Ages. In this way it begins to recapture a sense of the contemplation of truths of the faith and of speculation about them.....It also conveys a sense of connections and a viewpoint of the living organism...the dissociations..are denounced. It is extremely impressive to see the elimination of rationalism bring with it an immediate demand for the reunion of moral and dogma. At the same time the romantic current orders an end to the separation between theology and the world and its culture....Finally Romanticism brings to theology a sense of the vital, and, so to speak, of the "lived". It repeats the request ceaselessly renewed in the course of time: that of a theology allied to life, indeed of a theology in which life gives expression to itself. [Congar, 1968a,183-184]

2b. Renewal from Philosophy.

The nineteenth century saw the growth of several forms of Idealist philosophy following on from Kant's trancendental Idealism. The form of Idealism which influenced nineteenth century German Catholic theology, via Schelling, was an objective idealism which understood the real world as identical with the thought of the absolute, (conceived as spirit and life), and saw the self and this absolute as engaged in a dialectical process. One of the characteristics of German Idealism was a focusing on subjectivity. All being was connected with the mind thinking and reality was given meaning through the subject. This movement from objectivity to subjectivity was alien to the Catholic preference for the former as the safeguard against individualism and relativism, but it marks the end of the era of the eternally objective and the beginning of one which is focused on the subject and the idea of process and movement.

The period from 1760 to 1840 is one in which, according to Congar, theology sought its inspiration not in the Christian tradition, but "in the miscellaneous philosophies which by turn had their day in the sun....Leibnitz and

Wolf...Kant and Fichte...Schelling and Sailer...Hegel and Schleiermacher."[Congar 1968a185.]

2c.The Renewal of Scholasticism.

The philosophy to which the Popes wished to return was that of the Fathers and the mediaeval doctors, particularly that of St. Thomas Aquinas. The encyclical of Leo XIII, Aeterni Patris, 4th. August, 1879, called on the bishops " to restore the golden wisdom of Thomas and spread it far and wide for the defence and beauty of the Catholic faith." In the wake of this were set up institutes at Rome and Louvain, for example, to study the work of the 'Angelic doctor.' What had been intended by Pope Leo XIII was the re-establishment of a timeless, unified theology applicable to the whole Church but what emerged was an over-systematic, essentialist neo-Thomism, much more philosophical than theological. Pope Pius X indicated that the work of St. Thomas was to be the yardstick against which others writers were measured for orthodoxy, in the Motu Proprio 'Doctoris angelici', 1914, (AAS 338) and in the same year set out twenty four theses incorporating the essential principles of St. Thomas which were to be held in all the philosophical schools. (AAS, 383-386)

CHAPTER 1.

THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE.

1. Theological Influences on Congar.

2. Congar's Approach to Theology.

CHAPTER 1.
THEOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE.

1.Theological Influences on Congar.

1a. St. Thomas Aquinas.

There are almost as many ways of doing theology as there are theologians, but they fall into certain general categories. That which has flourished in the Roman Catholic Church for many centuries, and the one in which Congar was trained, was the scholastic method. A positivistic approach, it focuses on the deduction of rational conclusions from the propositions of faith, i.e. the elucidation and defence of theses framed with reference to scriptural and doctrinal source material. As a method it has the advantage of encouraging clarity and systematisation, respect for the sources and the development of positive argument, though on the debit side it can lend itself to polemics and to a hardening into an abstract system which takes no account of the fact that supernatural revelation does not come to us unmediated by its historical context.

Father Congar says that he was introduced to St. Thomas, as a young boy attending meetings for those who were interested in becoming priests. They read Aquinas always along with the commentaries of Thomas de Vio, Cardinal Cajetan, which were written between 1507 and 1522. Congar's study continued at the Carmelite Seminary in Paris and, since by that time he had already an interest in history, he approached the thought of St. Thomas not just through Cajetan but through history also. Thereafter at the Catholic Institute he had Thomist professors, including Jacques Maritain. The climate in which he received his early training meant that his philosophical formation was strictly Thomistic and indeed engendered a certain contempt for the 'moderns'.

> Men like Blondel, Laberthonniere and Maréchal were considered as contributing nothing to philosophy...When I realized that these men had great minds I began reading them earnestly. However by that time it was too late. I can say that I had no real philosophical formation. [Granfield 1967, 245.]

Father Congar feels that there is in St. Thomas Aquinas a sense of openness and even dialogue with the people and ideas of his time. This influenced our writer and he is also much indebted to St. Thomas for the fact that from him he acquired a certain 'spiritual structure', an orderliness in ideas. [Lauret 1988,70] St. Thomas was a model of intellectual honesty intent always on the pursuit of truth.

> He was not one merely to repeat conclusions that he had formed, once and for all. All his life he searched for new texts and new translations from the Greek and Arabic. As a man of dialogue St. Thomas frequently entered into discussion with the 'heretics' of his day. St. Thomas is the symbol of open-mindedness. [Granfield,1967, 247.]

He admits, however that there is a danger in Thomism of homogeneity almost at any price, of an over-systematisation and a dissociation from the real world. Maritain, dissatisfied with the positivism and materialism of his day, and believing that modern society suffered from a disease characterised by shallow subjectivism, relativism and anthropocentric humanism, which stemmed from the breakdown of Scholastic synthesis leading to a loss of unity and direction, thought that only the restoration of Christian philosophy could restore wholeness. He developed what Congar calls a 'Thomistic ontology', though it in fact depended on Jean de St. Thomas, from which he, Congar dissociated himself. His own approach was historical, not in the sense of relativizing, but in order to put the thought of Aquinas in its historical context and period. [Lauret,1988,73]

1b.Le Saulchoir and Father Chenu.

The quality which Congar has, of having a historical sense i.e. understanding that all that is human changes and that texts are of their time, have a context which is conditioned by what has gone before, stems from his Dominican training. Father Marie-Domenique Chenu joined the staff of the Dominican house of studies at Le Saulchoir in 1920. His research was concerned with mediaeval theology in general and in particular that of Aquinas, especially in its historical dimension. He was not an upholder of 'timeless Thomism' because although the truth being explained is timeless, the human condition dictates that this timeless truth can only be explained in time, with the

limitations that imposes. It is necessary to understand the setting in which a text or a doctrine originated, for the instinct which formed it is encountered in the cultural, theological, spiritual and philosophical context in which it took shape. So Chenu held that "St. Thomas could never be entirely explained by St.Thomas himself, and his doctrine, however lofty and abstract it might be, is not an absolute, independent of the time which saw its birth and the centuries which nourished it." [Chenu,(1937) 1985, 125.]

Chenu's students used the actual texts to come into contact with the spirit of St. Thomas, to consider his reactions to the problems put to him, and to work through them, and in doing so made use of historical method.[ibid] It was this approach to Thomism that Congar took up, " first by instinct and then thanks to the teaching and friendship of my elders -Chenu in particular." [Lauret,1988,73] Chenu was not interested in Thomistic philosophy as a system defined in inviolable propositions. He believed that theological work should be of its time, interacting with contemporary problems, anguishing with the people of to-day. Congar learned from his mentor the fact that the present life of the Church and actual Christian experience form the well from which theology draws its material. [Chenu, (1937)1985,124.] What Chenu wanted to do was to escape from the type of theology, which had arisen after, and in reaction to the Reformation, where faith is simple assent to dogmatic formulae on which a theological edifice can be built as long as the syllogisms respect the laws of logic, and to put in its place a theology within a living faith. It was an ideal which led to his "little book" being placed on the Index of Prohibited Books in 1942.

1c. Moehler and the Tubingen School.

The founder of the Tubingen school in 1817 was J.S.Drey, (1777-1853.) who introduced into Catholic theology important themes which he absorbed from the works of Schelling, Hegel and Schleiermacher, among others. Though influenced by the climate of the times, and desirous of synthesizing modern thought with the Christian heritage, the members of this group were also deeply attached to the Church by the sense of history which kept them in touch with the Tradition. In addition a profound grasp of the essence of the Church kept them from straying too far into philosophical byways. Although they were willing to borrow from Schleiermacher or Hegel to help expand the development of revelation in dogma in the Church, their latent traditionalism

prevented any full scale hegelianizing of doctrine. [Chaillet,1939.] In spite of this they were accused of being the fathers of modernism.

In Drey's Short Introduction to the Study of Theology the influence of Schelling can seen in the way he links subjectivity with religion and with revelation.[O'Meara 1982 ,98.]

Drey sees revelation as something more than religion. It involves a direct intervention of God in history. He tried to hold on to the objectivity of revelation while using romantic idealist forms as a method of explaining the ongoing dialogue between God and humanity. In so doing he was able to lay the foundations for a theology open to transcendental method and historical process and to create a school of theology which kept alive the romantic tradition.[O'Meara 1982, 102.]

Johann Adam Moehler, the church historian, (1796-1838) was a pupil of Drey and one of the outstanding figures in the Tubingen school. Pere Chaillet,S.J. in the Introduction to L'Église est Une - Hommage à Moehler [Chaillet 1939.] says that at the heart of his work lies the idea of unity, true unity expressed by Christian love and manifested in community. He sought the link between the experience of divine love and the visible objective Church, between the historicity of Christianity and the insights of Idealist philosophy with its dialectic of the progress of the human spirit as revealing God. The central theme of Moehler's work in the field of ecclesiology was the need to find a satisfactory way of expressing the relationship of the divine and the human in the church. There is always this tension in ecclesiology. The Church has a visible face, is an objective reality in time and space, but there is also the inner invisible reality; there is institution and there is mystical spirit. If polarization occurs we find the position where the Catholic Church is characterised as almost exclusively institutional as against the Churches of the Reform seen as 'interiorly' orientated. Balance is needed to maintain the relational character of institutional life and experience. Where there is too great an emphasis on the institutional, essential freedom is endangered, whereas to lay too much stress on the individual approach is to fail to take account of the societal or structural element.

In an article on the evolution of the thought of Moehler Sur l'évolution et l'interprétation de la pensée de Moehler [Congar 1938] Yves Congar mentions that Edmond Vermeil believed that under the influence of romantic idealism and German Protestantism , the Tubingen theologians, especially Moehler, undertook a re-casting of theology, the principal ideas of which

entered England in the works of Newman and Loisy, infiltrated thought in France also and were the principal inspiration and cause of Modernism - something expressly denied by Loisy himself, [Loisy 1930, 267-270.]

Congar believes that there can be no doubt that the thought of Moehler evolved over the years though there are differing views of how this came about. He reports that K. Eschweiler believes Moehler's early work, Die Einheit in der Kirche, (Unity in the Church) 1825, portrays the influence of Schleiermacher's idea of the Church as the outward expression of a spiritual Christianity, but he moves from that view to one of the primary importance of the visible historical church liberating the spiritual dimension from subjective bonds. Thus, under the influence of Schleiermacher and Schelling , Moehler in Die Einheit (Unity in the Church) puts forward the idea of a living religious experience under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, of which the hierarchy is but the reflection and expression. The love in the community which forms the faithful is expressed in the hierarchy of persons. However, as his philosophical standpoint changes and he is affected by Hegelian thought and uses Hegelian categories, he remedies in Symbolik the relativism and subjectivism implied by the way in which in Die Einheit he understood the relationship in the Church, between institution and living community. [Congar 1938, Eschweiler 1930]

Congar's own belief, as expressed in the article mentioned above, was that the view Moehler so frequently expresses - that the principal element in Church is not the conceptual or verbal apparatus, the institution, but the interior inclination , the living experience - comes partly from his, Moehler's, own temperament, but also from his contact with Protestantism. [Congar 1938.] Moehler had toured the German universities, Catholic and Protestant, and found inspiration largely in the latter - [Dru 1963,62.] The interplay between the ideas of the Reform and those of the Catholic Church provided the fertile ground in which his thought developed. In Die Einheit Moehler almost exclusively followed the line that the essence of Christianity is the interior spirit communicated to the faithful by the Holy Spirit and living in them as a life principle, drawing them to a life of brotherly love within the Church. It is of the very nature of this interior spirit that it expresses itself in external forms, dogmas, faith, tradition, worship and finally as ecclesial communion which, as it widens out, is expressed in the functions of bishop, metropolitan and Pope.

In Die Einheit, however, Mohler did not fail to recognise the aspect of divine

institution of the Church, which would include the forms in which this is expressed, but, says Congar, the main effort is directed to the essential primacy of spirit, with the Church as institution considered only as expressing the life of faith and love, the gift of the Spirit who is the gift, par excellence, of Christianity. Moehler understands the constitution of the Church as nothing other than embodied love.[Congar, 1939 ,258.]

In the Symbolik, however, Mohler sees the two aspects, spirit and institution, in a different light. The visible institution is no longer seen simply as expressing the interior spirit, but as a way of bringing it about. The Church as a visible society is no longer just the result of an interior mystical Christianity but also is the means of transmission and realisation of that Christianity. There is , however, only one Church which is the sacrament of Jesus Christ. Pere Chaillet quotes Moehler

> As truth can only be one, so Christian truth is one. The Son of God our Saviour is one; he is what he is and no other, eternally like to himself, always unique and the same...As Jesus Christ is one, as there is only one truth, which alone gives freedom, Jesus Christ willed only one Church, since it rests on faith in him and represents him, Christ and his work, always faithfully."[Chaillet 1939,19. quoting Symbolik, 36, 338-9]

The conclusion to be drawn from the above is that there is in Moehler's ecclesiology, a movement from a purely pneumatic approach to one which gives due weight also to the institutional or structural aspect of the Church. A more recent approach to the work of the German thinker is provided by Philip Rosato who concludes that Moehler directs us away from extremes towards balance, in ecclesiology.[Rosato 1968.] Heribert Mühlen's work in ecclesiology seeks, in part, to counter what he sees as the result of the work of the later Moehler, the development of the view of the Church as a continuation of the Incarnation. [Muhlen, 1969]

1d. Moehler's Influence on Congar.

Congar said to Jean Puyo in 1975 that the work of Moehler. like so many other things, had been revealed to him by Father Chenu, and that in Moehler he had found a much needed resource and was inspired to do for the twentieth

century what Moehler had done for the nineteenth. [Puyo 1975, 48.]
Writing in 1970 he says that Moehler restored the Church to theology, for she ceased to be regarded as simply an authority regulating belief and became a community whose principle was the Holy Spirit .We can assume that Moehler played a part in Congar's increasingly pneumatological understanding of the Church. Congar's ecclesiology shows a movement from emphasis on the institutional element of the Church to a fuller incorporation of the life and work of the Spirit in it and commentators detect the influence of Moehler in this.[MacDonald 1984, 28.] It is relevant to his vision of the Church as a communion and to his understanding of what it means to live in the Church. His influence can perhaps also be seen in Congar's interest in and desire for unity in the church, evident in his concern for ecumenism, for these were Moehler's pre-occupations also.
It should be said that even in his early work Congar was interested in the concept of 'life' in his understanding of Church. MacDonald notes that Moehler's influence can be seen in Congar's essay on ' The life of the Church and awareness of its Catholicity' which first appeared in French in Esquisses du Mystère de L'Église in 1941. Here he is arguing that it is as she becomes universal, in this very process, that the Church becomes aware of her catholicity: i.e. events in the life of the Church bring about her understanding of herself.

> The institution is something definite, it has its own interior law, like any living thing and the whole course of its development is animated by the Holy Spirit. But, precisely because it is an institution and not just a dogma, more can be learned about it by watching it live than by studying its formula.[Congar (1941) 1960, 146.]

In Congar's later work the whole Church comes to be understood by him not simply as animated by the Spirit of Christ, but as co-instituted by the Spirit. In his ecclesiology of communion the living dimension is integrated with the institutional. In other words, in ecclesiology as in other areas of theology the Word and the Spirit are to be understood as working together.
MacDonald sees the thought of Moehler also in Congar's attention to the development of a Christian anthropology which stems from an appreciation of the mystical body from within, in the manner in which it is realised by the Christian person living in the communion of Christians.[MacDonald 1984 ,29]

1e. Orthodox Theology.

According to J.P. Jossua, Congar " loves Orthodoxy very much and understands its attractions." [Jossua 1968, 77.] Congar himself tells how he came in contact with the thinking of the Orthodox Church through lectures on Khomiakov and the Slavophile movement at the Institut Catholique, his contact with the Russian emigres in Paris and his involvement with the ecumenical movement. [Congar 1964 , pp.xvi f.] Jossua tells us that Congar has derived from Orthodoxy a sense of the cosmic aspect of the Paschal message while being aware that there is in Orthodoxy a tendency to relative idealism coupled with a devaluation of things here below. [Jossua 1968,77.] This is one of the aspects of Orthodoxy which Congar criticises. The Slavophile movement lacks social awareness and pays too little attention to the Church in the world. While there is a stress on the cosmic dimension there is relatively little development, for instance, of means of holiness in the world. [Congar 1964, 282.]

He found, however, in the Orthodox tradition the importance of the sense of community, of a communion in love in which each one is active, " the most profound aspect of the idea of sobornost." [Jossua 1968,77.]

Congar discusses this concept of 'sobornost' in the sixth chapter of Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat but the English translator omits it. Although he is somewhat critical of the concept as being too vague, he judges that it contains a great deal of ecclesiological truth in spite of the fact that some Orthodox writers have corrupted it and added polemical nuances. The basic idea necessary for understanding the concept is one of unity - the unity of the human race, unity in Christ, the unity of the Church. Congar picks up from Soloviev the idea of uniplurality or unitotality, the unity of the whole in which the individual is, however, free. [Osner 1980,311] It is based on the belief that men and women exist as human persons only in a community, the ecclesial context being the community of faith and love. An ecclesiology of sobornost relies first on the unity of the body and only within that do the hierarchical powers, given to the Church, have validity. [Congar 1953,311.] There is no doubt that such an understanding is integral to his pneumatological understanding of the Church as a communion.

2. Congar's Approach to theology.

Having considered the influences on Congar it is now necessary to consider further how he carries out his theological work, the premises of his thought. Relevant here is his understanding of revelation and of the human being to whom that revelation is made. His starting point is certainly that all begins with God, but man or woman is actively involved also. Not only can he or she make certain true statements about God and reality by the use of the faculties which God has given them, but each individual is so structured as to be open to receiving what God communicates of His own knowledge of Himself and His will, for the God of whom we speak is a God who communicates with His people. This He does by words and signs which propose to us the eternal decrees of His will, His plan for our salvation.[Congar 1962a,5; Congar 1968, 204].

Theology, then, develops from a rootedness in faith, but God respects the structure of the beings He has created; He respects their rationality and so one of the ways the communication with them takes place is by the presentation of knowledge, though His communication is not restricted to knowledge alone. [Congar 1966, 237-8].

Congar's theology has a practical slant. He is concerned with problems such as ending the divisions between Churches and how to make the Gospel message credible to modern man. [Congar, 1935, 214-241] Above all, however, Yves Congar regards himself as one primarily concerned with truth; "I have devoted my life to the truth; I often think it is really the woman in my life." [Lauret, 1988, 71.] The way we come to know what is truth is not without problems; given his training Congar's approach to truth could be expected to be, and is, broadly in line with the teaching of St. Thomas. Truth is, however, in Congar's view, always conditioned by history, so he can say " I hold to the truth, but the real, i.e. truth with historicity, with its concrete state in becoming, is something else ." [Lauret 1988,71]

This concern for the real could be said to be the foundation of his theological method. From St. Thomas Aquinas he absorbed a concern for truth and an openness to it, but he also loves history and often uses historical enquiry as a way into theological discussion - in Tradition and Traditions for example. Indeed this method of historical appreciation is characteristic of many of Congar's works. Convinced of the objective truths of revelation and of the importance of their historical conditioning he approaches truth from both

angles and his whole theological approach is marked by this.

2a The Thomist Approach

(For the following analysis I have relied on the work by W.Henn, The Hierarchy of Truths according to Yves Congar ,1987)

Thomas defined truth as the conformity of the intellect and the thing (S.T I.q.16,a1.) with the corollary that truth is primarily in the intellect and only in a derivative sense in the thing. [ibid.] In this theory of knowledge, the known, the 'thing' is something outside the knower which presents itself to a receptive faculty in him. This, the fact that truth is primarily in the intellect, brings us to a consideration of how this comes to be in the working of the intellect. Aquinas believed that, while human knowing and awareness of self pre-supposes sense perception, it is in the act of knowing that the mind becomes aware of its ability to know truth. When speaking of truth we usually do so in connection with propositions, they are what is true; truth, therefore is to be found in the judgement. [Copleston ,1955,47.] While there are two basic operations at work in the human intellect, the simple apprehension of essences of material things and the operation of judgement, the truth is properly speaking attained by the latter in its acts of composing and dividing. This basic "realist" approach to truth in which the intellect genuinely knows reality by means of the judgement, is common to all Thomists, and the truth which is thus apprehended is, according to Thomas, one, eternal and immutable from God's point of view, while from ours it is many, temporal and mutable. This raises the problem of the relationship between the eternal truth and the imperfect ways in which it is grasped by human beings in faith at any given time. There is a truthful absolute reality of salvation which must be distinguished from the relativity of its expression.

Despite this core understanding Henn argues that Thomists go on to differ in their understanding of how the intellect in judging actually operates, for there are different aspects or "moments" which have to be considered as one answers the question which asks how the mind's conformity to the object, what truth is, is brought about. Is experience the most important thing, the input from the senses, or does the concept take pride of place, or the judgement itself, or are we dealing with an organic whole?

Congar's position begins from the premise that what is certain is that one can

know. With Gardeil, whose book La Donnée Révélé et la Theologie has been called, Congar says, " the most forceful and clarifying that has been written on the conditions of religious knowledge, dogma and theology" Congar would reject scepticism for he is confident in the ability of the human mind to know the truth [Congar 1937,500.] This belief that truth can be known is a characteristic found in Aquinas who, open-minded and desirous of seeing things as they really are, is inclined " to accept every mode of verity"[Congar 1966, 229.] Congar is convinced also of the possibility of the existence of a body of teaching with an objective content. [Congar 1967c,97]

His approach to ecumenical dialogue in Divided Christendom with its call to be loyal to one's own tradition and the understanding that truth has a power to convince, underline these beliefs.[Congar 1939,263] His condemnation of indifferentism, the view that all positions are equally valid, makes the same point. Indeed Congar calls such an approach "the first step towards practical atheism". [Congar 1967b, 45] Conviction that there is truth and that it can be discovered excludes this position. Taken together these attitudes confirm that Congar puts into action the epistemological rejection of scepticism which he learned from Thomas.

The Thomist view that the intellect achieves the truth when it is in conformity with reality, that it is the contemplation of reality rather than the use of concepts and words which promotes the knowledge of truth, is re-iterated in Theology in the Council [Congar 1966d, 219] Similarly, in A History of Theology in the context of a discussion of theological reasoning, he says that the theologian,

> refers constantly to a datum of realities received from without.... his concepts are merely means of expression, and his reasonings are means of distinction and verification. The datum and the realities exercise an absolute critical function with regard to all conceptualising and all reasoning. This dependence exacts from the theologian an attitude of total submission and radical 'poverty of spirit.' It implies that in each one of its forward steps , the ideological system which the theologian constructs must be critical and yet supple with reference to all the elements of the datum, each one appreciated according to its respective value....the factual references must be constant. For the least fact must be respected and if a theory proves to be too narrow or too rigid to take it into account the theory must be remoulded. [Congar 1968a,249-250]

With regard to the doctrine that there are two acts of the intellect, conceptualisation and judgement, and that truth is in the latter, Congar accepts that the first act of the intellect is abstraction. In the article quoted below he says that given that one agrees with Aristotle that there is an irreducible distinction between intellectual knowledge and sensible knowledge and that the world is so ordered that intellectual knowledge, which is universal and abstract, comes from sensible knowledge, Congar sees that there will always be a problem as to how the sensible, the given, transfers its content to the intellectual knowledge. The primary objects of human knowledge are the quiddities of things, the what, the nature of physical objects. This, says Congar is St. Thomas's fundamental epistemological option. [Congar 1974a,343: cf. Congar 1968a,203.]

The way in which Congar understands the nature of truth is found most explicitly by way of his reactions to the interpretations of other thinkers. So, for example, in his Histoire de la philosophie du Moyen Age he comments on M. Huffnagel's Intuition und Erkenntnis nach Thomas von Aquin saying that the study is excellent. [Henn 1987,54:Congar 1932, 604] Huffnagel records Thomas's definition of truth as the mind's conformity to a thing and the fact that the truth is achieved in the judgement; in the Summa the experience of truth is seen as being given only in the act of judgement itself. Congar makes no comment on this assertion but from his general commendation of Huffnagel's article we can conclude that he is in agreement with the general consensus that truth is primarily predicated of the intellect and only in a derivative way of the thing and comes from judgement rather than from the apprehension of essences.

Congar's view of judgement can also be deduced from a discussion in Concilium concerning the way in which the church, receives a truth. He says

> Reception includes something more than what the Scholastics call obedience. For the Scholastics it is the act by which a subordinate submits his will and conduct to the legitimate precepts of a superior out of respect for the latter's authority. Reception is not a mere realisation of the relation 'secundum sub et supra'; it includes a degree of consent and possibility of judgement in which the life of a body is expressed which brings into play its own original spiritual resources.[Congar 1972a, 45]

This seems to say that something is not to be accepted as truth simply because it is promulgated by a superior but that the truth is accepted in the act by which the intellect of the hearer pronounces a judgement of acceptance on it. Again in a discussion of infallibility where he is contrasting his views on the subject with those of Hans Küng he sees infallibility as the characteristic of very carefully specified judgements. " It concerns judgements about points bearing upon the truth of the religious relationship." [Congar 1970b,616] It is the act of judgement which is properly called infallible as distinct from the propositions which express that judgement. "'infal'ible' qualifies secondarily a proposition but primarily the spirit who professes the proposition in the act of judgement in which he professes it." [ibid p.607]

If then truth is in the judgement, how does one come to know that the judgement is valid. Henn points us in the direction of Congar's view by way of a discussion of the understanding of Paul Wilpert and concludes that he finds the basis for the validity of judgements in the analysis of the evidence which renders them either doubtful or certain. [Henn 1987, 60.]

For Congar, then, truth is attainable, known to us in the same way anything is known, from image, species, concepts and judgements, particularly in the judgement in the use of which one analyses evidence in order to arrive at either certainty or doubt. This basic position, therefore, could be used to support the truth of Scriptural or doctrinal statements. Congar does not consider and therefore does not refute, the modern post-Kantian critiques of the meaningfulness of religious language or religious truth. The Thomist approach to truth is not, however, the only one and Congar admits that his ecumenical work and his study of history have led him to an appreciation of other approaches. [Congar 1986, 6]

2b. The Historical Approach.

The Thomistic approach emphasised the objectivity of truth and how it could be possessed but there is another aspect from which the topic can be viewed, that of subjectivity and historical development. Congar's general attitude is one that could be termed authentically 'catholic' in that his preference is always for the inclusive rather than the 'either...or' approach, and he is happy to add this other dimension, in which the influence of Father Chenu's emphasis on history and the historical method can be detected.

Congar deplored an attitude which sought to view and judge all things from a Roman Catholic point of view. Such an attitude focused on the objective and rational aspect of Catholic faith, on the authority of the magisterium and on a mistrust of human experience and goodness. [Congar 1950, 644- 66.]
He objects to such an approach because it gives no place to the role of history or to that of subjectivity in human knowledge of the truth for he places great importance on the historical aspect of Christianity saying

> We need to note the historicity of every human conception and word. This applies even to the dogmas of the Councils, the very texts of the Scriptures. This does not relativize the truth itself. What is true is definitely true. It relativizes only our approach to the truth; we do in fact approach the truth, we do not attain it in one go, we gain it. [Congar 1981 a,70]

History is the acknowledgement that man lives in time, that he is involved in events which follow one on the other. Before we came into being men lived and after we have gone others will follow; but that is true also of the plant and animal kingdoms, so what is it that makes the history of man different? It is the fact that man knows that he is part of a related unfolding, he can look before and after, he can see that his individual existence is not in isolation but engages with the being and thought of others of his kind.

> Man is not only situated in time and affected by temporality: he has a history. Each human being, and humanity as a whole, has a history and neither the angels above us, nor the animals below us in the scale of creation share this feature with us. For, to have a history, it is necessary to be in time and, at the same time to go beyond it, to rise above it. Because man transcends time, what he does in time is not only able to survive it (this is ensured in animal generation already, in the work of the species) but is recapitulated and permits a certain progress. Better still: all communicable acquisitions can be integrated into the fulfilment of a meaningful destiny. There is a distinctively human story, men have as such a design; this is not true of dogs and apes. History requires a dynamic and autofinalized unity of what is accomplished in time successively, not a mere succession-repetition of it.[Congar 1966, 256-257]

In the Christian context what gives this unity to the lives of men and enables one to speak of the history of the People of God is the belief that God created His people for Himself, made a covenant with them and brought about their final redemption in the life, death and Resurrection of His Son. Christianity could be said to be the transmission of a supra-historical message in historical form. Congar therefore discusses theology in the context of the historical revelation of the design or plan of God. This concept, of revelation presented not as a list of propositions but as the story of what God has done for the good of men and women, is one which he sees as being a fruit of the renewal of the study of the sources. [Congar 1968a,12] God's work of grace and salvation is seen as taking place, not in some timeless ideal spiritual realm, but in time, indicating that time itself is of value. [Congar (1950)1968, 125.] He uses the analogy of the growth of a plant from seed to explain what he means. As the seed contains all that will emerge as the plant grows, so in human history, as given ideas and events are reflected upon, the passage of time brings a ripening which results in both new problems and new solutions as each age goes beyond what it has to new values and new forms. Similarly the divine plan begins with a seed which contains, in embryo, all that will ever come from it, and proceeds in stages to its consummation. [Congar (1950)1968, Ch.2.]

The danger with this analogy is that it could be seen as suggesting that both human history and the economy of salvation proceed automatically, of necessity, with consequences for our understanding of human freedom. It is clear, however, that this is not his intention; human history is not determined but is the place where the human being's creative liberty is at work. What develops is not **simply** a programmed development of the potential in what has gone before. [Congar, (1950)1968,125, n.1.]

Similarly with the work of God; the given is there in germ but the fullness to which it is ordered is neither totally visible nor totally determined,it develops in stages, through promise and fulfilment of promise, through an interactive relationship of God with His people which takes the form of call and response. [Congar (1950) 1968, 127.] This introduction of a constructive role assigned to individuals removes the suggestion of determinism contained in the use of the analogy from nature. He stresses that all ability to co-operate with grace and divine initiatives comes from God, but it is the individual who makes the co-operative effort (itself only possible by the grace of God) as time brings

about the development from seed to fruit, from promise to reality.[ibid,129.]
The final 'stage' is eschatological. Between the seventeenth and twentieth centuries, according to Congar, much of the eschatological perspective had been lost as understanding of it had narrowed to an individualistic, other-worldly concentration on the 'last things' - death, judgement, hell and heaven. A re-discovery of the importance of the 'end-times' came about, rooted in the emergence of the viewpoint of historical development taken up in the work of Moehler and the Tubingen school, and nourished with the return to the Biblical sources. Eschatology became what it was in Scripture, the meaning of the movement of history, operating in the present order but to be understood as the goal of that order's movement. [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985, 462] It is, however, only when the final chapter has been opened that the fullness of the meaning of the historical process will be disclosed. So any statements we make about truth are, in a sense, provisional, allowing therefore, for the possibility of diversity in perception and expression.[Congar1984,169,170] Congar believed that the re-discovery of the sense of history and of eschatology allowed the ecumenical progress of the Second Vatican Council. [Congar 1984a,101-102]
This expression of the way God discloses Himself, in an economy of salvation, fits in with Congar's historical understanding of truth as something which comes about by first the gathering and then the integration of the fragments which lie scattered throughout the tradition and history of Christianity. [Congar 1967 a, 428-429.] "Truth is synthesis and fullness."[Congar,1967b,73.]It also accords with his belief that biblical truth is something which develops in human history under the guidance of the Holy Spirit.[Congar 1970b,609]
The notion, included in that of the design of God, that it is furthered by an interactive relationship with human beings, brings into the picture the viewpoint of the subject. Charles MacDonald states however, that Congar underestimates the role of human freedom in the evolution of the divine economy.

> Man has at most a negative influence on the evolution of the plan...the lack of a positive stress on human freedom has the effect of diminishing the importance of human history. One searches in vain through the work on Reform to find a clear statement that human history is itself a part of the Plan of God. [MacDonald 1982, 68.]

Yet Congar recognises the importance of the subjective viewpoint as can be deduced from his stress on the importance of conscience, and from his acceptance of the fact that certain paternalistic uses of authority do not do justice to the initiative and intelligence of the individual.[Congar 1984a,187 & 308.] He also states that as far as Revelation is concerned, what is 'given' is made known not only in the history of the world but by it.[Congar 1967c,72] This suggests a realisation that the events of history, which are the events of human beings, have a positive part in and a relationship to, the unfolding and understanding of the plan of God.

From the point of view of one interested in a theology of the Holy Spirit the approach to theology through history is an important consideration. In so many ways it is through His Spirit that God is said to work in history, in creation, in prophecy, in the hearts of humanity, even in the cosmos, and finally in His Son and the salvation of all. This is a constant thread woven into revelation and indeed into the experience of His people. It is from such a perspective, it is suggested, that Congar is led to incorporate a pneumatological element in his theological understanding. It will be argued that if one can deduce from what he has written that for Congar the Spirit is involved in the way one comes to belief, that the Spirit, who is the Spirit of Christ is involved in the very being of Christ, that he co-institutes the Church, keeps her living in the truth and is the very principle of her life one would be justified is according his theology the designation 'pneumatological'.

2c. The Pastoral Approach.

Congar's approach as so far described lies within his basic orientation, to theology as an exploration of the way God works with His people to bring them home. Though trained in Thomistic philosophy and theology and a historian by inclination, Congar is essentially a pastoral theologian. This marks his understanding of the language of revelation and of faith. He understands there to exist a design of God, executed in time, completed in eternity, the object of which is to bring all men and women " into fellowship with His divine life" [Congar 1985a, 59] The first step in the accomplishment of this is that God should reveal Himself and His plan

Congar's Thomistic education affects his view of people in relation to God and of how they acquire their knowledge of Him. For St. Thomas theology is a

synthesis of the convictions of faith and reason, and this Congar follows. His own version of 'proof' in fundamental theology- in the sense of providing the context in which one can speak of the God whose existence the act of faith accepts- is that there is within the human being an absolute love for the good, which cannot be denied if one is not to suppress a constitutive part of one's very self; it is to the soul in need of orientation towards this good, which is its ultimate end, that God reveals Himself for acceptance in faith.[Congar 1935,217] Faith comes into being when one realises that the Christian God fulfils the criteria for being that absolute good which one desires. The normal demands of human reason safeguard the credibility of the movement from general disposition towards the good to the embracing of the Christian faith as the goal to which the general disposition points.[ibid]

Congar's vision is a very Catholic one of the human person, in all creation alone capable of knowing and making affirmations about the world and all that it contains, and even, at the very limit of his or her intellectual powers, powers which exist only because they are given by God, capable of making certain truth statements about the Supreme Cause of all that exists. [Congar 1962a,5] The human being can go no further than this, so, that more might be known of His Being and His plan, God must intervene to communicate with His creatures. Therefore "God unveils Himself to us and speaks to us of Himself." [Congar 1968a,204]

Revelation is disclosure. If God is to communicate with His creatures there must be a kind of descent into the limits of time and human expression, for since human beings cannot of themselves go to Him, He must come to humanity. This He does by created signs and expressions, the words and acts of the prophets, the apostles and above all of Christ, brought to the believer in Holy Scripture and in the Tradition of the Church, in her dogmas and in their explanation by the Fathers and theologians. Thus in Scripture man learns about reality from God's point of view, and theology reproduces "God's *science*, that is to say the order according to which God in His wisdom links all things together...and finally brings all things to Himself" [Congar 1968a, 95] Revelation is forever linked to its purpose, the salvation of humanity. This understanding marks all of Congar's theology.

CHAPTER TWO.

AN OUTLINE OF THE ISSUES.

1.Christology.

2.Theological anthropology.

3.Ecclesiology.

CHAPTER TWO.
AN OUTLINE OF THE ISSUES.

The Christian faith is essentially concerned with the relationship of God with men and women, with how His acts affect their existence and bring about their redemption. Christians believe that God acts according to a plan of salvation worked out in human history and that in executing it He brings about a relationship with them: i.e. it is in human history that God freely establishes personal relationships and freely reveals Himself. His plan culminates in the salvific life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ, the personal revelation of God. This being so, the study of theology is " Christological *quoad methodum*, (as to the method) and theocentric *quoad subjectum*(as to the subject)."[Congar 1968, 221: Schillebeeckx 1967,138] That is, it is from Christ that the final revelation of God and His plan come. Christ points always to the Father. So the way Christ and his relationship with God is understood, is of vital importance since it determines the way the Father is seen and understood in relation to humanity.

1. Christology.

It is fundamental to Congar's approach that though Christology may be the study of the 'who' of Jesus of Nazareth, it also involves an understanding of what he did. Christians are Christians because they believe that the life of Jesus of Nazareth had a significance and a function different from that of the lives of other men. Christology matters because who Christ is cannot be separated from what Christ does, and what Christ does touches the destiny of all humanity. This is central to the thought of Yves Congar. "The incarnation has an aim, and that aim is Easter and eschatological fulfilment."[Congar 1983, III,165.) This concern, to relate the doctrine of Christ to the destiny of human beings, is the motive force behind Congar's 'pleroma' Christology of which more will be said later.

Also central to Congar's theology is a conviction of the Trinitarian nature of salvation. God is by nature Three, and to fail to give due weight to any one member of the Trinity is inevitably to distort one's vision of God. A comprehensive theology, and this includes Christology, must begin with a correct doctrine of God and must incorporate all that is known of Him. The

member of the Trinity who is most often forgotten is the Holy Spirit. A theology which neglects the role of the Holy Spirit and which fails to meditate upon the part which the third member of the Trinity plays in all aspects of the dealings of God with men, is a defective theology.

The relationship of pneumatology to Christology has been re- examined and discussed by several theologians in recent years.(Walter Kasper, Jesus the Christ, Philip Rosato, Spirit Christology, Ambiguity and Promise, Piet Schoonenberg, 'Spirit Christology and Logos Christology.) This new interest in the Holy Spirit in relation to Christology is part of the wider pneumatological movement whichhas arisen in the Roman Catholic Church since the Second Vatican Council. This in itself may be in part a re-action to the criticism by the Eastern Churches that the Roman Catholic Church, indeed the whole Western tradition, is too Christocentric, a criticism which has been acknowledged as the Western and Eastern churches have become more open towards one another. Congar mentions remarks in this vein made by observers at the Second Vatican Council and it is to be expected that he, as an ecumenist, should take note. An assessment of his success in relation to this will be made in the final chapter of the thesis.

Yves Congar has devoted the later part of his life to work on the Holy Spirit, including the role of the Spirit in Christology, and in this chapter Congar's preliminary Christological insights will be discussed as a preparation for the consideration of his treatment of the Spirit in relation to Jesus Christ. The people to whom the revelation of God in Christ is made must also be considered in relation to the God who is Trinity.

Congar does not give a full rendition of his Christological understanding. His book Jesus Christ is not the presentation of a thought out Christology but a series of meditations. His baseline however, is the classic Christology of the Catholic Church as set out by Aquinas. The growth of his historical approach, however, means that he becomes less happy with this traditional presentation.

It will be argued that the addition of a pneumatological element can be interpreted as a way of giving Congar's Christological 'theory' increased explanatory power , making it more comprehensive and coherent in that it incorporates more of the data, and ensures that this area of theology is seen to be consistent with other doctrines, that of the Trinity for example.

Congar as has been said, has set out his understanding of the design of God as a planned endeavour, executed in time, completed in eternity, the object of which is to bring all men and women into fellowship with His divine life. In

that great panorama which stretches from creation to the eschaton there is one focal point - Jesus Christ . He is " the sole means for the realisation of God's purpose of fellowship." [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985, 60.] Before Christ God had not left His people alone. He had communicated with them, he had spoken to them, he had called them, he had chosen them. However in Jesus of Nazareth God finally and totally reveals Himself. The God who till then had only spoken, is now seen. The Eternal Word lives among men and women and is himself the revelation of which others had only spoken.[Congar 1966, Ch.1.] In fact he is not only the revelation of God to men, but as Rahner says, the self- communication of God; i.e. though the prophets spoke about God , in Jesus Christ " it is God Himself who speaks of Himself." [Congar 1966, 16.] This understanding of Jesus as the revelation of God - not only in what he said but in what he did - [ibid p.17.] is not used by Congar as the beginning of a Christology 'from below', still less as a way into a kind of 'Jesus-cult' deplored by Barth, indeed he does not spend much time on a consideration of the historical Jesus, but it prompts the thought that the actual historical, human life of Jesus, the way God chose to reveal Himself, must be important. If it was simply the teaching of Jesus, however sublime, which was important, we could not say that here was something of a radically different order from all that had gone before. Jesus however, claimed that God made an offer of salvation to humanity, an offer which was contained in and irreversibly linked to, his own life, death and ultimate resurrection whereby God confirmed His offer in power. In the Christ event, Christians believe, something really happened, something which decisively affected humanity's relationship with God, and it happened through the life and death of a historical individual. How can this once and for all event have universal significance? This is one of the questions which has to be answered. Christ was both God and man. What does this mean? Since God chose to save in this way the humanity of Christ must have some purpose. Christ's humanity because it is conjoined to his divinity, becomes the channel, the secondary cause united to the primary cause, of our divinization.[Congar 1985,60] The relation of the humanity to the divinity in Christ is one of the puzzles Congar feels is not solved in traditional Christology.

Restoring the original order when it was undermined by sin, the Incarnate Word, Jesus Christ, permitted creation to achieve the purpose God had willed for it. Salvation is understood by Congar as a unity, yet there seems to be an internal differentiation in this single event. Why is it that humanity still

struggles, suffers, is sinful, in short still seems to need salvation, in spite of the proclamation that the fullness of the goodness of God has already been given to the world in Jesus Christ. Congar points out that God's communication of Himself, as Father Son and Holy Spirit, will not be complete until the eschaton. In the economy the self-communication of God in Christ takes place in conditions of kenosis, [Congar 1983, III,15.]

Christology is the attempt to interpret the redemptive significance of Jesus in all its dimensions and for Congar any explanation must remember the purpose of the event and must accord it full historical attention, including giving to the humanity of Jesus its constitutive place.Throughout Christian history there have been many attempts at such interpretation of the redemptive significance of Jesus of Nazareth, including those in the New Testament itself though it speaks primarily in functional language.

1.a. The Ontological approach.

The earliest philosophical understanding of how the one Jesus could have redemptive significance was in terms of being. The first Christological controversies centred on the status of Jesus, who he was, for it was in these terms that his redemptive function was understood.

The relationship of Jesus of Nazareth to God is finally expressed in classical Christology, very close to that of the gospel of John, in terms of the descent of the Logos. The pre-existent Word of God , by virtue of a hypostatic union with Jesus of Nazareth, became the Christ who suffered and died on Calvary and who rose from the dead, thereby bringing about a new creation - 1Pet.1,22- 25. In such a Christology the focal point is the Incarnation; what is important is the descent of the Word and the union of the divine with (a) human nature. Thereby all is accomplished.

The advantage of the Logos model for Christology is clear. It makes perfectly plain who Jesus is. It safeguards his uniqueness. There is no danger of thinking of Jesus simply as a charismatic figure who was in an especially close relationship with God. This was the Christology with which Congar grew up and which he found very attractive. However, as he, among others points out, it also has its dangers. Walter Kasper indicates that

> Mediaeval scholasticism separated the doctrine of the person of Jesus Christ, his divinity and his humanity, and the unity of both, from the doctrine of the works and offices of Christ. Christology became an isolated and abstract teaching on the divine-human constitution of Christ. The question was incessantly posed of the being-in-itself, the virtual being of the true divinity and humanity of Christ; it became increasingly less evident to men what all this meant for them and their life. [Kasper 1976,p.22]

Congar also, holds that too great a focus on the person of Jesus can lead to a neglect of his work and this, after all, is the point of the Incarnation. It is to be understood as part of God's design for us as it involves man's ascent to God as well as God's descent to man.([Congar 1966,Ch.1.] To counter this danger it is necessary to incorporate the Soteriological Approach.

1.b.The Soteriological Approach

Christianity teaches that this particular individual, Jesus of Nazareth, reveals how the plan of God will be accomplished. He is in a unique relationship with the Father himself, and brings about the relationship of all men with God. By his salvific acts Christ affected our relationship with God; because he died and rose again and sat on the right hand of the Father we are enabled to do likewise. i.e. he is deemed to provide the ultimate answers to the perennial human questions about existence, its purpose and meaning. The study of Christology is the study of how this historical person and event can have universal redemptive significance. Of crucial importance is the fact that Jesus not only reveals God but also the way to be one with Him, " the means and joy of this communion " [Congar 1966, 16.] and it is one of the dangers of using the Logos Christology exclusively that this might be forgotten. This was not the case in the early Church where, although the necessity of establishing formally that Jesus Christ was both God and man led to discussion in ontological terms, the reality of men's salvation was of such paramount importance that all the Christological developments had this as their basis. It came to be the case when, as Kasper has pointed out above, some strands of mediaeval theology so separated the doctrine of the Person of Christ from that of his Work that all attention focused on the very being of Christ at the expense of the aspect of his being-for-us. Congar would exempt

Aquinas from this charge for he did more than simply define the ontological nature of Christ, "He was conscious of Christ's finality as the redeemer and the mediator of salvation propter nos et propter nostram salutem, for us and for our salvation." [Congar 1986, p.85]

The main features of Congar's Christology as set out in Volume III of I Believe in the Holy Spirit, and in The Word and the Spirit, are an integration of the soteriological with the ontological approach to Christology, and a re-assertion of the importance of a proper view of the humanity of Christ, but he has been concerned with these in earlier works also. In an attempt to connect the lives of men and women with the Christ and to make sense of their historical reality and to explain the fact that the Christ event did not immediately bring into being the eschatological kingdom he develops a 'pleroma' Christology .

1.c.Christ as Alpha and Omega.

Charles MacDonald says that it is a fundamental insight of Congar's Christology that there are two 'moments' in the mystery of Christ - the paschal stage and the parousia stage.[Mac Donald 1982, 75.] This means that there are two ways in which Christ acts for us. In his suffering and death he acted for us, we are redeemed in him. In the time of the eschaton we will be redeemed to him, united with him, sharing plenitude with him. Jesus Christ is both principle of salvation and goal of salvation.

> Christ is the Alpha and the Omega of the whole relationship of man with God...He is Alpha only through all his acta and passa in carne for us whilst he is Omega with us ...He is Alpha as principle and root... he will be Omega as effect and fruit , in a state of fullness, of opening out, of unfolding all the powers of the Shoot. [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985,163]

There is only one mystery of Christ but there are two different stages with relation to us. The Christ who is Alpha, alone does everything for us and we can only accept (Col.2,9 - in him the whole fullness of deity dwells bodily - Eph.3,19 - you may be filled with all the fullness of God) whereas when there comes the stage where Christ is Omega " we also are his fullness, because he wills to 'complete himself 'in us and to take his full stature from

and through us. Eph.1,23; 4,12-13." [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985,163]
The two ' moments' are, however, linked. They are linked by the time between. This is the time of the Church and the bond which makes the link "Inwardly ....is his Spirit; outwardly it is the sacraments and the apostolic body that ministers them." [Congar (1957 65) 1985,164.] As has been said earlier, Congar believes that this is the time when people have a part to play in the working out of the drama of salvation. They must work with Christ in history so that they might enjoy the time of bliss with him hereafter.

> It is necessary that by our co-operation, our acting, one might say by what we bring as free persons, all that he [Christ] has done for us and communicates to us, be also done by us in such a way that at the same time we receive all from his plenitude and he is fulfilled in us. [Congar1963a,251]

The approach put forward here suggests that man can contribute something to the fullness of Christ and so raises questions about the meaning of 'pleroma Christi' and about how the Church or the individual can contribute to it. Congar indicates that the actions of the 'Church militant' affect Christ and the whole ' Church triumphant'. He bases this on the fact that Christ prayed and therefore hoped, and without he says, wanting to go into what this meant, Congar believes in

> the concrete reality of a real hope in Jesus, not only of what He expected from God during the days of His passible flesh but also of what He expected from Him for His Body which is the Church and for the salvation of the world [Congar 1966b,96-97]

Christ, Congar believes, prayed for the fulfilment of God's plan and this prayer will only be answered at the end of time. Since Christ himself has hopes in relation to the working out of God's plan, that working out must be important. Since it is the object of hope there is still something left to be accomplished.
Charles MacDonald believes that " the notions of plenitude, of the Church adding to the plenitude of Christ, of Christ being the principle of the whole process of movement towards plenitude, and the theme of the incompleteness of Christ's pleroma are pillars on which Congar's views of history and

eschatology rest." [MacDonald 1982, 77.]

The dynamic aspect of Congar's Christology which has in mind the movement of all history, in accordance with the plan of God, towards a final consummation is in line with the approach of the Epistle to the Ephesians. His view that the Church, with its members, does something in this process which in some way can be said to be " the fullness of Christ," is more controversial.

On grammatical grounds 'pleroma' in Ephesians 1,23 may be understood as the fullness or completion of Christ.[Yates 1971-72,147] It can readily be understood that the acceptance of this interpretation is an instance of Congar's desire to assign to the historical condition, and to his ecclesiology, an importance and a Christological foundation. In a sense they "complete" Christ. The theological difficulty is that this implies that Christ is in some way deficient. Aquinas (because of his understanding of the total infinity in all perfections of the Word made flesh) denies that there is hope in Christ in the sense in which Congar is using it. (S.T.IIIa,q7,a.4.)

Yates mentions a solution by use of the notion of corporate personality. Christ is the inclusive personality into which Christians are incorporated by faith.[Yates 1971-2,150] Ignace de la Potterie on the other hand, understands the fullness to reside in the glorified Christ with his Church receiving it from her Head. [de la Potterie,1977,524]

Congar assigns to the historical process a constitutive character. It is suggested that his understanding is that since the freedom to accept or refuse God's offer of salvation must be real if men and women are to be more than puppets, there is a sense in which the future is fluid and is made by the Christ/human being relationship. So it is only when the end of time has come that Christ can know and can take the completed entity and present it to the Father. Congar does not consider philosophical problems such as, for example, the relation of God's foreknowledge to human freedom.

This understanding of the Christ event connects with Congar's view of man in relation to God and with the pneumatological slant in his work. The Spirit is always associated with the action of God in His creation. A view of Christ and of salvation in a dynamic relationship with humanity and its history would have to be pneumatological.

1.d.The Humanity of Christ.

Congar's insistence on the importance of the humanity of Christ can be seen in the criticism which he directed at the Christology of Luther. Far from failing to recognise the importance of the soteriological approach, he says, Luther goes so far in the direction of Christ-for-us that he may be said to reduce Christology to Soteriology.

Luther believes that it is not in contemplation of Christ as God and Man, that is of the being of Christ, that we come to know him. We do this by contemplation of what he does for us. Christ is the God of our salvation, the God known only in His saving acts. So, says Congar, although Luther appears to be faithful to the Councils - Jesus true God and true man, one divine person in whom two natures are united - the reality is somewhat different. Though Luther affirms that there would be no salvation if Christ were not both God and man, and says that the teaching on the Redemption pre-supposes the teaching on the Incarnation, and so provides an orthodox framework, within that framework he has put a new emphasis. The stress is pre-dominantly on the good news of salvation. Leaving aside all speculation on ontological questions, he has seen, in the Incarnation, God for us. He perceives an active God, known, and knowable, only in his salvific action. [Congar 1964,482.]

Congar believes that this turning away from speculative theology, from contemplation of the being of the mystery of Christ, has certain definite consequences.

Luther's Christology lacks a Trinitarian dimension. He pays no attention to consideration of the ontology of the Incarnate One. What is important is the good news, not speculation about the one who brings it. Because of this " The Word of God is not personalised enough, it is not clear enough that his eternal Person, which is joined in time to a humanity, is that of the second Hypostasis of the Holy Trinity." [Congar 1964, 483/484.]

It is the lack of a real understanding of the relationship between the human nature and the divine person in Christ that leads Luther to see, in the Incarnation, God abasing Himself into humanity. He finds it difficult, Congar says, to give a causal role to Christ's humanity.

It is because he believes so strongly in the necessity of acknowledging the role of Christ's humanity, the fact that he acted consciously and in freedom, that Congar says that he does not regret his criticism of Luther despite the criticism levelled at him by Pannenberg though he would now supplement it and correct

it in certain respects, though he does not elaborate.[Congar 1983,III,166]
Congar insists that a full Christology must correctly understand and explain the divine and the human in Christ, both equally and inter-relatedly necessary for man's salvation. Although from the beginning the redemption of man was recognised as being of the essence of the message, it was only gradually that the explanation of that redemption was worked out. At Chalcedon the main Christological questions were answered, but Congar, following Father P. Smulders, believes that "it was only the crisis caused by Monotheli tism and the solution provided by the Councils held in the Lateran in 649 and at Constantinople in 680-681 that threw a clearer light on the fact that, in the truth of his human nature, Christ had been called to realise himself and his mission as Messiah and Saviour by acting consciously and in freedom." [Congar 1983,III,165]
If there is not a real recognition and acknowledgement of the intrinsic importance of Christ's human life there remains the constant danger of falling into monophysitism. In Christ, Our Lady and the Church he said that not only does Catholic piety and preaching tend to separate the divine and human natures in Christ, but theologians also make the same mistake. He put this down to a failure to understand the metaphysical sense of 'person' as the principle which gives to the individual his reality. Personhood is the principle by which the individual exists in his own proper being, separate, unique, unable to be confused with any other. It is that on which I take my stand, what makes me, me. What happens is that

> Those who use current language understand by personality deep-rooted moral and psychological elements which characterise the individual at the level of conscience and pattern of life. This meaning in metaphysical usage belongs not to the person but to nature, and an effort of some difficulty is entailed in passing beyond the current meaning of personality and seeing it solely as the metaphysical principle of existence attributed to the whole subject whose being and activity can be set down under the heading of nature. For lack of this distinction Apollinarius, confusing the person or the hypostasis with the complete nature, and being unwilling to recognise in Christ more than one person, saw no other solution than to withdraw from his humanity the final element of its completeness, namely the nous by which it would be psychologically responsible. [Congar1957,47.]

It must be remembered that person and nature are of different orders. Human nature is perfect in Christ. It is perfect physically and spiritually. All activities of the will and its freedom, the conscience, the intellect, though they may be spoken of in terms of psychological or moral personality, are in reality part of the perfection of the human nature of Christ. However, this nature has existence only by virtue of its union with the metaphysical principle of being which is that of the Word.

> The metaphysical principle of created and incommunicable existence which permits of saying 'I' so exclusively that it cannot be said except of oneself, is, in Christ, supplied from the very beginning by the Uncreated Principle of which the 'I' in this case is the Word. [Congar 1957,50]

In Christ human nature is taken up, assumed, hypostasized by God's free decision. Jesus Christ is perfect man only as he subsists, as a person, in the way in which God subsists as a person. The **theological** importance of holding on to the doctrine of the complete manhood of Jesus in Christology is to give that humanity a real role in redemption . If Christ's manhood is only apparent then our salvation is imperilled.

Paul Schilling asks whether Congar succeeds, as he certainly intends, in preserving the importance of the humanity of Christ. If it is a member of the Trinity who is the subject, who really bears the responsibility for the actions of Jesus Christ, how does this not detract from the importance of the humanity of Christ? Does it not make his humanity in some sense different from ours? If the 'I' in Jesus which makes him different from all others is that of the Word, a divine Person, is Jesus fully human? Does not full humanity demand human individuality? [Schilling 1966, 202]

The doctrine that the humanity of Jesus subsists in the hypostasis of the Logos always carries with it the danger of somewhat diminishing the humanity of Christ. This accounts for the variation which holds that the Word assumed not a complete human nature but a complete human being. It is possible to hold this as long as one remembers that there is only one subject in Christ, the Person of the Logos. There is the danger of understanding the humanity as being only the locus of the work of the divinity, something which is used by God for a specific purpose. It is important for us that the humanity of Christ

should be real and also that it should have been assumed for a purpose. A seeming assumption, one which was merely the veil behind which God operated, would undercut the whole idea of salvation by God made man - " what is not assumed is not healed."

Though the Word, in and through the humanity of Christ, performs divine actions, Congar says that humanity is not an instrument in the same sense that the violinist's bow is an instrument. It is more akin to the hand for it is "an instrument united in its very being to the power working in him. [Congar 1957,51] Rather by using Christ's humanity in its fullness, including his human understanding and liberty, God carries out, instrumentally, divine actions such as forgiving sins and raising from the dead. The perspective here is that of Ephesians, " God was in Christ reconciling all things to Himself."

It is suggested that what Congar has been quoted above as saying in Christ, Our Lady and the Church is not enough to make it clear that the human nature of Christ has a real role in salvation. It will be considered whether Congar in his later theology goes beyond this.

2.Theological Anthropology: The relationship between theology and anthropology.

Anthropology, the science of humankind, presents the facts about men and women and their world in a scientific way. Theological anthropology is the study or the science of humankind from the viewpoint of theology. It is man who believes and theologises. The faith and the theology of the individual is grounded in his or her humanity. Although all theological reflection has for its object God Himself, it is Congar's conviction that one cannot separate discussion about God from consideration of man and woman, the 'in-itself' from the 'for-men'. [Congar 1983, III,165.] The Christian God is God for humanity and so theology must enter into dialogue with anthropology, exploring what it is that makes the human being different from the rest of creation, what it means that he has aspirations and qualities that set him apart. Congar's biographer, J.P. Jossua, suggests that his pre-occupation, as early, he says, as 1932, with the necessity of integrating into Christian reflection the modern pre-occupation with subject, foreshadowed his later assertions concerning the impossibility of separating anthropology and theology. It is Congar's view that " through man whom He creates, through the Man whom he becomes, something of God is revealed. Everything is there in this union of

anthropology and theology" [Jossua 1968,127

In conversation with Patrick Granfield, on being asked what he considered the greatest challenge facing modern theology, Father Congar answered " The most important work to-day is to show the unity between theology and anthropology. They are always related." [Granfield 1967,249.] Congar is thinking of the position of the many who wrongly believe that " one cannot affirm man and his great role in the world without saying that God is dead. This is false and we must show them why it is false." [ibid.p.250.] This is in keeping with his welcome for an approach to theology which takes account of the fact that the theologian should not do his work in isolation, ignoring the reality that there is an unbelieving world out there. The Church and her theologians have a duty of "proposing the faith successfully to the men of this day and age....It is a question of establishing a new dimension of reality...which, in keeping with the nature of Revelation, embraces God and man and treats at length of the religious link between them. " [Congar 1968a, 13,14] The spiritual life of the Christian is based on the premise that God acts in this world and is experienced in it - both the Old and the New Testaments witness to this e.g. Gen. Ch.12, L.24,36- 49, Acts 9,3-6 - and that His acting has as its purpose our eventual union with Him. It would seem that the perennial pre-occupation of Christians ought to be how to be one with the God who " is not ' the eternal celibate of the centuries', but love and goodness. (He) places beings outside himself in order to bring them back to himself so that they can participate in what he is in his sovereign existence." [Congar 1983, II, 67.]

It is of course not the case that Christians always put the search for God first on their agenda. Perhaps it never was so for the majority , but especially to-day when the climate of thought is one which encourages the view that man controls his own destiny, is the architect of his own this-worldly salvation, the serious believer feels somewhat isolated. When religious beliefs do not fit easily with what has been learned from the findings of philosophy, of science, of the behavioural sciences, one is tempted to abandon religion. There is a tendency among the religious to lose confidence.

Congar , writing in 1967, spoke of the existence of a climate of opinion in which there is dependence on personal conscience and the existential experience of 'existence in the world', and of there being among many a painful feeling of insecurity rooted in the situation in which they find themselves. It is the appreciation of this that causes him to insist that it is

necessary to show that theology and anthropology are inextricably linked, i.e. that 'God-talk' does have a relevance for modern men and women. Christians, he says, "have presented a cultic religion without anthropology, without history and without world. Atheism responds with the affirmation of man, history and world without God." Congar concludes, therefore, that "one of the most urgent tasks of theology to-day consists in giving us a fully acceptable anthropology and providing a synthesis of this anthropology with theology."[Congar 1967c,37]

There can be no doubt that this is still a valid agenda. Much of the popular criticism of the latest encyclical of Pope John Paul II, 'Veritatis Splendor' [1993] is based on the fact that it is seen as failing to take account of the situation of the human person to-day. Congar. however, is not is favour of jettisoning the traditional approach, of St. Thomas, for example. His thoughts are in essence traditional in that he has said that he is distressed to see young clerics, and sometimes even seminary professors, trying to invent a new synthesis from scratch, to meet the needs of modern man. His concern is to study the tradition, understand it and follow the spirit of it, rather than either to abandon it or to follow it slavishly. He does not condemn all new approaches saying that he is entirely in agreement with the way in which Rahner and Schillebeeckx study theology in the light of modern anthropology.[Granfield 1967,248]

3. Ecclesiology.

Though Christology and anthropology have been mentioned first, Yves Congar is perhaps best known in connection with his ecclesiological work, especially its ecumenical dimension. It has been said that "there is no one Congarien ecclesiology".[Nichols 1989,52.] It is true that there are many ecclesiological themes which are of interest to him. This stems partly from the fact that, as a historian by inclination, he is well acquainted with the richness of the traditions, both biblical and theological, developed through the centuries, and partly from his conviction that the way to the fullness of truth comes from the integration of available viewpoints. [Congar, 1967a, 428-9.] He quotes with approval Hans Urs Von Balthasar's view that " Truth is symphonic." [Congar 1981a, 68] His early interest in ecumenical work is connected with this attitude and led him to study and to try to explain to others the oneness of the Church which in turn led him to study her very foundation.

It also led to a consideration of the need for reform in the Church and in 1950 he published Vraie et fausse réforme dans l'Église. He was also interested in the place of the lay person in the Church and believed that "in a wide context of ecclesiological renewal the need for a theology of laity becomes more and more evident".[Congar,(1957 & 65) 1985, xiii.] His Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat published in 1953 was a step towards this. It was his vision of the Church, and his openness to other traditions which brought him into conflict with authority. He says that "from the beginning of 1947 to the end of 1956 I knew nothing from that quarter (Rome) but a ceaseless series of denunciations, warnings, restrictive or discriminating measures and mistrustful interventions."[Congar 1964,xlvi] Those in authority did not appreciate his vision of the church. His ecclesiology of the people of God, for example, put in question the juridical hierarchical vision of the Church which had grown out of the Counter Reformation. This concept of the church as People of God was not in fact an "innovation" - Father Congar stresses that he didn't intend a kind of democracy, but rather the active participation of all Christians in the life of the Church - but one of the ecclesiological themes which had been lost sight of during the period of hardening of ecclesiology in the manuals. [Puyo 1975,102] His desire to "return to the sources" also met with opposition although, he says, he wanted "to restore the genuine value of ecclesiology by viewing, as far as possible, the totality of Catholic doctrine and by using the rich sources of tradition and applying it to the current problems of the Church." [Granfield 1967,251-2]. He was also suspected of a too easy irenecism. From the 1930's all those who worked in the ecumenical field were suspect.[Congar 1964, xlvii] Yet it was because of Congar's real love of the Church that he sought the restoration of her original unity in Christ. To this end he set up the Unam Sanctam series the first volume of which, Chrétiens désunis published in 1939, set out to propose a possible way towards the unity of the various Christian denominations, based on an attitude which was " evangelical, fraternal and friendly" and which would involve the Roman Catholic Church examining herself and reforming herself, because " the most effective work for reunion... consists in living, in a more abundant life." [Congar 1939,272.] He felt that the Church should rethink the way she presented herself for he believed that it was often the appearance of the Church which turned people away and contributed to unbelief because "what our brethren take for Catholic doctrine is sometimes nothing but a caricature, or else so superficial that it amounts to a distortion."[Congar 1939,268] He

felt that he wanted to show the full richness of the Church by starting a series which would present traditional ecclesiological themes which had been forgotten or overlooked as the formal tracts on the Church developed. [Granfield 1967 251-2.]

His critics, however, according to James Connolly, felt that his conciliatory approach went too far and that this, taken with his willingness to face up to the deficiencies seen in the history of the Church, involved a danger of diminishing the true value of Catholic teaching.[Connolly1961,111] Congar certainly believed that reconciliation would never be achieved while the separated churches saw reunion as absorption entailing the total acceptance by other Churches of all that Rome believed. They would have to feel able to "retain their own spiritual treasures intact, enriched and transfigured in the fullness of communion."[Congar 1939,271]

Such an attitude, encouraging for the non-Catholic Christian in that it acknowledges that he or she is part of the life of Christ, was feared by many in the Roman Catholic Church and contributed to Congar's being silenced. It is strange yet fitting that the very institution which sent him into exile was to ask him only a few years later, to join the theological commission of the Second Vatican Council and he was to see many of his views become those of the Church. It must be said however, that the Roman Catholic Church has not been very speedy in welcoming those from the Anglican Church who wish to come " with their spiritual treasures intact" in the wake of their own Church's decision to ordain women to the priesthood.

Father Congar, in his writing on the Church, did not confine himself to any one model. He was happy to take up the biblical images of Body of Christ and People of God, to study the Church in her visible form as a society or as an ecclesial communion in which the Spirit is at work. Aidan Nichols sees the hand of Congar in the multiplicity of images used in the Second Vatican Council's Dogmatic Constitution on the Church.[Nichols 1989,55[

The aspect of Congar's ecclesiology with which the present study is concerned in the pneumatological. This is the aspect which, concerning as it does, the Church as a living and lived experience, was apt to be minimised by the juridicalising tendency. Congar, even in his early writings, had a view of the Church which went beyond that current in the Catholicism of his day. He understood that to attempt a too rigid conceptualisation was to lose the aspect of mystery and to be left with an artificial construct rather than a living entity. This insight was developed throughout his life and culminated in an

understanding of the Church which has been enriched by becoming more pneumatological. Although Congar was never without concern for the role of the Holy Spirit it will be argued that a deepening of this aspect led to a richer ecclesiological synthesis as he becomes more aware of the presence of the Spirit in all areas of ecclesiology and of the possibility of interpreting all areas in terms of the Spirit. This includes the existential implications of a Spirit-orientated vision of the Church. With the pneumatological widening of Congar's vision it will be argued that he is better able to integrate the individual with the structure, the local Church with the universal, and to present a living reality in which the Spirit is at work.

CHAPTER THREE:
THE THIRD PERSON OF THE TRINITY.

1.The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament.

2.The Holy Spirit in the New Testament.

3.The Holy Spirit in the experience of the Church and the Theologians.

4.The Procession of the Spirit.

5.The Holy Spirit as Gift.

6.The Holy Spirit as " the Unknown One Beyond the Word.

CHAPTER THREE
THE THIRD PERSON OF THE TRINITY

There can be no doubt that it is difficult to grasp the nature of the Holy Spirit.

> The Spirit is without a face and almost without a name. He is the wind who is not seen but who makes things move. He is known by his effects. [Congar 1983,III,144.]

Congar's approach to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is traditional. He intends, according to the general introducion to his three volume work, I Believe In the Holy Spirit, to follow in his study "the classic rules of faith seeking understanding." [Congar 1983,I,vii.] The believer wants to understand what she or he holds in faith on the basis of Scriptural revelation and of what is experienced, and has been experienced by generations of believers, in and through the Spirit.[ibid]

In line with his penchant for a historical theology, Congar understands our objective knowledge of the Spirit to be derived from both Revelation and Experience. Concerning Scripture, he makes the point that though it makes statements which are sometimes dogmatic in character and sometimes theological, it largely speaks of God and the Spirit in images, and this for a reason which reveals, it is submitted, his primary theological concern; images are metaphors which reveal, not what God's being is in itself, but " they only express behaviour and what that represents for us." [my underlining] This is especially true of the Spirit.

Although Scriptural revelation is primary, constitutive and normative, Congar does not believe that our knowledge of God comes only from this source because God has acted and continues to act in history and in the lives of human beings and has continued to allow us to learn about Him even after the death of the last apostle. [Congar 1983,I, xvii.] Christian experience has to be questioned because revelation, and knowledge of the Spirit are "affected by a certain lack of conceptual mediation." [ibid p.vii.] The Holy Spirit is not revealed to and known by us directly in himself, but through what he brings about in us. [ibid p.viii.]

Experience is understood by Congar as

> "our perception of the reality of God as he comes to us, is active in us and

operates through us, drawing us to him in communion and friendship, as one being exists for the other." [Congar 1983, I,xvii.]

This experience is not visionary and does not remove the distance which separates us from God. It does, however, bridge that distance at the level of our awareness of a presence of God in us as "the beloved end of our life" in ways which range from the extra-ordinary experiences of the great mystics to the 'ordinary' signs found in prayer, the sacraments and the life of the Church, and in the love of God and our neighbour. It is to be found in "the effects of peace, joy, certainty, consolation, enlightenment, and all that goes with love." [Congar 1983, I,xvii-xviii.]

This turning to experience is an important development in theology. There is no doubt that experience of God was at the heart of the New Testament Church but it is a dimension which came to be lost as theology developed along rational lines and, in the West, along non-personal lines. With the demise of this experiential aspect went the virtual disappearance of the Spirit as the christological, anthropological and ecclesiological edifices of theology were constructed without him. In this chapter how Father Congar understands the Spirit in Scripture will be considered together with the insights in the tradition considered to be those he judges most important , and those which are integral to his theology especially as it moves to approach the theological enterprise from a new stand-point, that of the Spirit.

1. The Holy Spirit in the Old Testament. [Congar 1983, I,3-12.]

In the Old Testament the Breath/Spirit is the action of God, creative and life-giving, characterised by having the power to transform. Congar situates the work of this Spirit of God within the context of the design or plan of God, bringing about its accomplishment from the moment of creation, through the deeds of the charismatic leaders up till the time of the establishment of the monarchy, through the Messianic line of David to Christ himself. [Congar 1983,I,5f.] The prophets also, inspired by the Spirit of God according to the texts of the Deuteronomic period, in those of the Exile and in post-exilic Judaism, play their part in setting out the designs of God. The Spirit of God takes hold of individuals and uses them for God's purposes, even against their will.(Num. 24, 2ff.) Isaiah is the prophet who makes most use of the concept of the Spirit of God. He uses it to emphasise

Yahweh's sovereign power, (Is.31,3; 30,28) tells of the deliverance of the people of God, of the future hope and the coming of the one on whom the Spirit will rest with all the gifts that are necessary for a reign of justice and peace, the Messiah. (Is.11,1.ff.) The gift of the Spirit will then be extended to those who play a part in the ideal rule (Is.28,5-6) and yet again to Israel, to the people of God. This is seen in Ezekiel, (36,26-27; 37,4f.) The Spirit of Yahweh will bring life and holiness, God will make Himself known. (Ez.39,29) What is foretold is a new beginning, a new hope, a renewed people; finally in Joel's prophecy of eschatological events it is revealed that the gift of the Spirit will be extended to all peoples. (3,1-2)This is the prophecy which Peter proclaimed was fulfilled on the day of Pentecost.

In the Wisdom literature, Wisdom and the Spirit are almost identified, at least, Congar says, if they are viewed in their action. The real function of Wisdom " is to guide men in accordance with God's will" thus she, and so the Spirit, is connected with the intimate action of God. "They are God for us and with us "[Congar 1983,I,11] From the Wisdom literature also Congar takes up this reflection on the idea of Spirit.

> The spirit is characterised by its subtlety and purity, which enable it to enter everything and everyone and, while remaining unique, to be in everything and everyone as the principle of life, newness and holy conduct. [Congar 1983, I,11]

He connects this thought with Ps. 139,7-12. and Job 28,20-27. (on Wisdom)

Congar finds Old Testament foundations for much of what is important in his theology of the Spirit; the movement of the plan of God, through the Spirit, to deeper interiority till its absolute eschatological realisation, and the connection of the Spirit with interiority, with the involvement of man's whole psychosomatic being when God through His Spirit guides and inspires,[Congar 1983, I.5.] This involvement of the Spirit/Wisdom with sanctification in that he/she is the innermost guide in the souls of human beings, is grounded in his/her very being, as is the limitless nature of her actions. This is not to say that there is a personalisation or a doctrine of the Third Person of the Trinity in the Old Testament. The Spirit of God is the action of God. In other words the Spirit manifests the One by whose power certain things occur in the world and in the human being [Congar 1983,I,4.]; the Spirit is God in touch with His creation, the

Spirit is God experienced.

2. The Holy Spirit in the New Testament.

Neither does the New Testament contain a reflected theology of the Spirit and Congar sees it as his task to try to find from the texts, the meaning to be attributed to the revelation and experience of the Spirit in the messianic period. He chooses to begin his study of the experience and revelation of the Spirit in the New Testament with the life of Jesus. It is interesting that in so doing he focuses first on the manifestation of the Spirit at the baptism of Jesus as the beginning of the messianic mission, the opening of a new chapter.[Congar 1983, I,16.] This signifies a concern with the soteriological function of the Spirit and a movement away from what was for many centuries the traditional way of grounding the salvific mission of Jesus in the Incarnation itself, the union of the Word with the humanity of Jesus, rather than in the descent of the Spirit on Jesus at his baptism. It is argued that this approach resulted in a dualism in Christology which led to the neglect of the human life of Jesus and that this Congar endeavoured to put right. Congar attaches great importance to the baptism of Jesus with its associated mission of the Spirit. While the Patristic tradition had a sense of the part played by the baptism of Jesus, seen for example in Basil of Caesarea's discourse on the Holy Spirit (XVI,39), the more pervasive theological understanding was that which connected salvation with the incarnation rather than with the baptismal anointing. While this latter way of understanding the sonship of Jesus as grounded in the incarnation, that is in essential or ontological terms, is a valid one, Congar feels that it is disappointing if one is looking for a historical theology grounded in biblical sources.[Congar 1983, I,22] What he would no doubt prefer is an approach to sonship as a reality which comes about through the historical life of Jesus Christ. This will be discussed further in the chapter on Christology.
Mark begins his gospel with the call to conversion and the baptism of Jesus. This is the beginning of the "good news" of salvation in Christ, the beginning of the eschatological period characterised by the gift of the Spirit. Neither Mark nor Luke, both of whom mention it, connect the fact that Jesus is the one through whom the Spirit enters history as messianic gift, that Jesus is the one who acts through the Spirit and will ultimately give the Spirit, with his birth. Both connect it with his baptism. [Congar 1983,I, 16.] Congar accepts that the New Testament makes use of an Old Testament pneumatology; the Holy Spirit is the Spirit/Breath

of God, creative and life-giving, the force by which Jesus performs miracles. This Spirit is received by Jesus through an act of God and there are in fact two " missions" or "sendings" of the Spirit; the first makes the Jesus in Mary's womb holy, Son of God, and the second, at his baptism, declares him to be the Messiah, consecrates him for his salvific mission so that he is enabled, upon his exaltation, to communicate the Spirit of God. [Congar 1983,I 16.]

He refers to the theology of Heribert Mühlen, which presents the intra-Trinitarian relationships in terms of inter-personal relationships, as one which attaches great importance to the anointing of Christ at his baptism by the Holy Spirit. Basing his theology on the insights of Richard of St. Victor, who says in relation to the Trinity, that the Holy Spirit is the "condilectus" of the Father and the Son, the one who is loved by both because love requires a going-out to a third, Muhlen argues that the Holy Spirit is the We-in-Person, of the other two Trinitarian Persons. Just as a marriage is not of one or of the other but of both, and has of itself a meaning which goes beyond the parties involved, so analogously "We" is a concept which has a certain reality or objectivity of itself, not being simply the sum of the "I" and the "Thou". In the Trinity the Spirit as Person is entirely relational. Whereas according to the doctrine of perichoresis the persons are within one another by virtue of the unity of the divine nature rather that by virtue of the relations which constitute the persons, the Holy Spirit *as a Person* is

> at the same time and in a similar manner in the Father and in the Son. He is ONE PERSON IN TWO PERSONS and is so in a way which cannot, in this sense be postulated of the Father or of the Son. The Holy Spirit unites the Father and the Son in such a way that he is numerically one and the same person in them both. [Mühlen 1969, I,273.]

The Holy Spirit is Person by being the relationship between the Father and the Son and his mission is the fruit of his eternal procession from the Father and the Son " as the term of their mutual love." [Congar 1983,I,24.] Mühlen attributes the sanctification of Christ at his conception not to the hypostatic union but to the Holy Spirit; it is however, to the Spirit as proceeding from the Son who is hypostatically united to the humanity. Referring to the view of Duns Scotus that in one temporal instant there can be several 'logical' instants, Mühlen says that in one temporal instant two different mysteries occurred, two things quite distinct in their nature. The Word became incarnate assuming the humanity of Jesus and the

Spirit was sent by the Father and the Son to the humanity of Jesus made Person by the Word; i.e. the Incarnation is a relationship of person to nature while the mission and anointing of the Spirit is a relationship of person to person. [Mühlen 1969, I, 269] There follows another 'mission' of the Spirit in the Church. Congar notes that the mission of the Spirit is presented as the consequence in time of his eternal procession from the Father and the Son and accepts it as in accordance with the dogmatic explanation of the mystery. He does not go into the question of whether Mühlen is reading back into Scripture a later Trinitarian theology. Congar has accepted that the New Testament basically uses an Old Testament pneumatology. It is clear that for Luke it is the Father who sends the Spirit. [Congar 1983,I,16.]

While Mühlen Congar says, attaches great importance to the baptism of Jesus, understanding it as a "prophetic anointing by the Holy Spirit which is bestowed on him with others in mind" [Congar 1983,I,29,n.55. quotes Una Mystica Persona, p.219] he does, however, in Congar's opinion, make too much of a distinction between this anointing for others, and the anointing of the humanity of Jesus by the Spirit in Mary's womb. "Personal grace and capital grace are strictly identical in Christ." [Congar 1983,I,29 & n.55]

What is essential to Congar's understanding is that the salvific work of Christ cannot be separated from what he was from the beginning. It is clear, however, that he perceives the work of the Spirit in the synoptic Gospels to be within the context of God's plan as Jesus accepts baptism by John, (Mt.3,15) receives the Spirit and experiences the presence of that Spirit in him, all decisive moments in the human life of Jesus. It is as one led by the Spirit that Jesus lives out his ministry. From what seems to be a general approval of Mühlen's theology, though not total acceptance of its application to ecclesiology, and knowing of his desire for a historical theology, it would be justifiable to conclude that Congar understands the interaction of the Spirit with Christ in relational terms in the course of a human life.

From the Pauline corpus Congar concludes that the gospel of Christ is understood as a realisation of the promise made to Abraham. It is the gift of the Spirit which is the object of the promise of salvation and it becomes effective through faith aroused by the proclamation of the Word. (Gal.3,2:1 Cor.2,4-5.) It is by faith and baptism that the believer begins a new life in the Spirit (R.7,6: 8,2) and acquires an eschatological inheritance.(2 Cor.5,5. Eph.1,14.) This is because the Spirit

> who made the humanity of Jesus ... a completed humanity of the Son of God through his resurrection and glorification, (R.1,4. Eph. 1, 20-22, Heb.5,5.) does the same for us ...and makes us sons of God. [Congar 1983,I,31.]

It is often pointed out that Paul attributes effects, such as justification and righteousness, indiscriminately to Christ and to the Spirit. Congar explains this by saying that it is the Spirit, who is the content and end of God's promise and also eschatological gift, who makes Jesus Lord, Son of God in power, life-giving Spirit able to bestow the Spirit on others.[Congar 1983,I,39.] In the Spirit the glorified Christ manifests his presence and lordship. This insight of Pauline theology, the connection of Christology with pneumatology, which Käsemann says is a decisive factor therein, means that while Christ is present in the Spirit " conversely the absolute criterion of the divine Spirit is that he sets the community and its members in the discipleship of the crucified" [Käsemann 1980, 221-222.] The Spirit is therefore tested against christology yet ecclesiology is not overwhelmed by christology for it is also the sphere of power of the Spirit.
Congar also extracts from Paul the fact that our life in Christ, in the Spirit is ecclesial. The Spirit dwells not only in our very bodies but also in our community, and this without infringing our liberty, because of what he is

> the principle of communication and communion between God and us and between us and our fellow men ... sovereign and subtle, unique in all men and uniting persons without encroaching on their freedom or their inner lives. [Congar 1983,I,33.]

This indicates an attempt to link what the Spirit does with who he is, and fits with Congar's approbation of the theology of Muhlen and his appreciation of the Spirit as, 'par excellence' relational. Congar is at pains to make clear that Paul's basic premise is that Christ is the all of Christianity (1Cor.3,11) The work of the Spirit is to form Christ in the Christian, to bring sonship, to enable the individual to say 'Jesus is Lord'. Therefore the event of the experience of the Spirit which must have been the basis for the foundation of the Pauline Churches, is presented as linked by Paul to teaching about the Spirit.
From the way in which Congar refers to the work of others, Büschel and Warnach

for example, rather than from what he says directly we may conclude that he finds in Paul indications of personality in the Spirit. The Spirit is not simply a force but " God himself insofar as he is communicated present and active in others." [Congar 1983,I,39.] The texts which speak of the Spirit as bearing witness, (R.8,10) or establishing fellowship, (2 Cor.13,13) being sent into our hearts, (Gal.4,6) and interceding for us (R.8,6) are not simply metaphorical language but indicate a free personal being, and the triadic formulae present that Spirit as equal to God and Christ.

In the Gospel of John Congar finds a much fuller teaching on the Spirit, but again teaching which associates him with Jesus. Jesus is presented not only as the one who has the Spirit, and has it without measure, (Jn.3,34.) but also as the one who gives the Spirit. This giving of the Spirit is linked to the symbolism of water, the 'living water' which Jesus gives, thus presenting another image alongside that of wind or breath, one which, Congar says, following Swete, was sometimes applied to the Spirit but not commonly. The messianic giving of the Spirit is understood by John to be the prerogative of the glorified and risen Jesus, (7,39) but there are other indications of the giving of the Spirit which Congar finds in the Fourth Gospel. The death of Jesus is described as 'giving up his spirit' and Congar, while acknowledging that one cannot say that it is the Holy Spirit who is involved, links this with a 'breathing out' over Mary and John "who are, as the Church " at the foot of the Cross, and says that clearly, at the symbolic level, there is a close connection between the death of Jesus and the giving of the Spirit. [Congar 1983,I,52.]

The giving of the Spirit by Jesus to the disciples on the evening of Easter day, (Jn.20,21-23.) before he is fully glorified, is not a gift of the person of the Spirit, " there is no article preceding pneuma hagion ", but a giving of the force or power of the Spirit so that they may undertake their mission, a continuation of his own, to bring about purification and the remission of sin.

> ...he communicates his breath to the apostles as energy active in the Church for the forgiveness of sins. It is, as it were, the beginning of this promised gift of another Paraclete. [Congar 1983,I,53.]

Of the teaching on the Paraclete, peculiar to the Fourth Gospel, Congar says that while certain personal characteristics are attributed to him and he is presented as the subject of a number of actions, teaching, (14,26) communicating, (16,13f) for

example, it is still probably impossible to draw any direct conclusion regarding the doctrine of the Trinity.[Congar 1983, I,56.] Indeed Congar is not very interested in speculative theology about the Trinity. Referring briefly to Jn 15, 26. and 16,14-15. he asserts that of course the Father is first and absolute origin of the Word and the Spirit and then moves immediately to his real area of concern, the work of Christ and the Spirit in the economy of salvation.

The Gospel of John, he says, has a coherent, deeply Trinitarian understanding of the place of the Spirit in the Christian mystery. Jesus is the one sent from the Father who lives out his life entirely for and to the Father and is both the revelation of the Father and the communication of eternal life. We must cling to him through faith and charity. [Congar 1983,I,59.] The real function of the Spirit/Paraclete , the Spirit of truth, is to bring about in the disciples the experience of and faithfulness to the revelation of God in Christ. After the death of Jesus it is the task of the Spirit to continue the work of Jesus enabling the believer to welcome and live out in faith the revelation of the Father as the source of faith and love, and bringing about a new relationship between Jesus and his own. [Congar 1983,I,56.]

From the writings of Paul we have seen that Congar concludes that the work of the Spirit is above all ecclesial, building the Church , doing always the work of Christ and to this end and this end only, distributing his gifts; and this all on the foundation of what he is, not an impersonal power but God communicated. [Congar 1983,I,39.]

Luke also understand the Spirit as bringing together Christ and his Church, ensuring their continuity.[Congar 1983,I,44.] It is Luke in particular who ensures that the Spirit is not understood as simply resulting from the remembrance of what Jesus said and did. A new event of the Spirit is necessary also. He is involved in the making present and in the dissemination of the salvation gained by Christ. His coming is not a replacement for Christ but a transmission of his prophetic ministry to proclaim God's message.[Congar 1983,I,45.] The Spirit intervenes at all decisive moments in God's plan, that is his comings are historical events. Luke, says Congar, portrays the dynamism of faith and the growth of the Church rather than providing, as Paul does, a theology of the working of the Spirit in the sanctification of the individual, a theology of the fruits and effects of the Spirit. Congar feels, however, that it would be wrong to conclude from the differences between the Pauline and Lukan writings that 'mission' and the

the spiritual life should be separated. The powerful work of the Spirit reported by Luke must be based on the working of the Spirit as principle of sanctification within the young Church and that it would be too sweeping to dismiss Luke's understanding of Spirit as only in Old Testament vein. He says he agrees with Haya-Prat that there is in Acts a movement towards personalisation of the Spirit so as to regard him as different from Yahweh, though of course the question of that distinction had not yet been put.[Congar 1983,I,46 ;Haya-Prat 1975,82-90]

It is clear from the way in which Congar deals with the New Testament witness that he is interested in the functional aspect of pneumatology - with what the Spirit does and brings about. This is because his over-riding concern is ecclesiology and, in his own words, the Church's life has always been "overshadowed by the Spirit, Dominum et vivificantem." [Congar 1983,I,151.] It does not mean, however, that his pneumatology is purely functional, looking at the work of the Spirit in a manner totally detached from concern with who the Spirit is, detached from his relationship to Christ and the Father, or considered as an impersonal empowering force. On the contrary he is at pains to ensure that the work of the Son and the Spirit are seen as inextricably linked and grounded in the being and will of the Father. Indeed it is argued that he is concerned to ensure that the Spirit is retrieved as the essential connection between Christ and salvation, between Christ and the Christian. He is concerned that his theology is biblical and historical. [Congar 1983,I,22.] His understanding of the Spirit is connected with his historical understanding of truth and with his belief in the progressive nature of revelation. He takes the New Testament as witness to Jesus Christ as the one sent by the Father open to the Father's plan for him but makes an immediate connection of this salvific destiny with the presence and action of the Holy Spirit. The mission of Christ as Messiah and suffering Servant is linked with his baptism and the anointing by the Spirit . The life of Jesus is a life in the Spirit and as Risen Lord he is enabled to give the Spirit to others. It is appropriate that this should be because the Spirit in biblical pneumatology is associated with the creative power of God, His life-giving power and control over history, and with universal eschatological salvation. All that Congar has said, taken with his concentration on the Johannine teaching on the personal nature of the Spirit, if we can put it in such terms, indicate an understanding of the need to place the work of the Spirit in the context of the biblical witness to him. It is disconcerting, however, to find that his own thought is so often presented in terms of agreement with statements which others have

made. One is left with a strong desire to ask what he really thinks.

3. The Spirit in the Experience of the Church and the Theologians.

Congar moves from his consideration of Scripture to touch on the continuing experience of the Spirit in the early Church which saw itself as " subject to the activity of the Spirit and filled with his gifts." [Congar 1983,I,65.] Charisms were important but Congar picks up the difficulty that arose when there was too much emphasis on them and points out that there was no question of there being a 'charismatic' as opposed to an 'institutional' Church, for both were equally the work of the Spirit. The danger was perceived by Irenaeus who saw that the Montanist excessive excursion into prophecy and eschatological expectation had to be dealt with not by attempting to suppress the charisms, but by welcoming them and integrating them with the ecclesial body. Congar says that Irenaeus recognized that bishops and brethren on the one hand, and the Spirit on the other, conditioned one another.

> It was for this reason that where the Spirit is there is also the Church and also that where the Church is there is also the Spirit. [Congar 1983,I,68.]

This way of thinking will be seen to be echoed in Congar's own desire to integrate more fully the Spirit with the institutional Church. [Congar's work to integrate the 'life' and 'institutional' aspects of Church will be discussed in Chapter Six]
It was on the foundation of Scripture and the experience of the Spirit that the Fathers and Doctors of the Church built their theologies of the Spirit. Congar surveys this development but does not include here a section on his own theological understanding of the Third Person. It can be seen again from the way in which he moves from the developments in Trinitarian thinking brought about by the Cappadocian Fathers, to the resulting application of those developments in liturgy and worship, that his primary concern is pastoral rather than speculative theology.

4. The Procession of the Spirit.

It is well known that the question of whether the procession of the Spirit is from the Father or from the Father and the Son provides an instance where differences

in speculative theology have contributed to tragic pastoral consequences in the separation of the Churches of East and West. It is still common to-day to cite the Filioque as the decisive factor preventing re-union between the Churches of East and West yet both were attempting the same task, to present everything that Scripture said about the mystery of the Spirit . Theological argument was always subordinate to this but because Scripture was so reticent all theologians were forced to stretch human language and use human concepts to try to explain something very elusive.

Eastern pneumatology to-day, though it goes back to the Greek Fathers, is affected by centuries of anti-Western polemic. As a result it does not just state its own position but very largely also criticises Western theology. Vladimir Lossky and Nikos Nissiotis represent the school which describes the Filioque as heretical and ascribes all theoretical and practical problems in the Western churches to it. [cf. Lossky (1944) 1957; Nissiotis 1967]

Congar sets out his understanding of the Eastern position.[Congar III,72,f.] The Orthodox begin by affirming the three Persons of whom they can speak either as hypostases, or in their relation to the divine essence. In Western theology, however, the Persons are identical with the essence so, he says

> This means that, as far as the Holy Spirit is concerned, dependence on the Son in the divine essence also implies dependence on him with regard to the hypostasis. [Congar 1983,III,72]

In Eastern theology however, it is possible to hold that the Person or Hypostasis of the Spirit comes from the Father alone yet say also that the Spirit receives the divine essence also from the Son. They accept the unity which is communicated from the Father, and it is He, together with the perichoresis or circumincession of the Person, which is the principle and safeguard of that unity. Eastern theology sees no need to go further in distinguishing between the Persons than the Scriptural 'begetting' and 'proceeding' whereas in Western eyes this is not enough and the hypostatic being of the Persons is found in their 'subsistent relationships'. The relationship which constitutes the Spirit is a common act of spiration by the Father and the Son. Lossky says that for the East

> the relationships only serve to *express* the hypostatic diversity of the Three ; they are not the basis of it. It is the absolute diversity of the three

> hypostases which determines their differing relations to one another, not vice-versa. [Lossky 1975,79]

The Eastern Churches in addition to condemning the unilateral addition to an ecumenical creed, that of Nicea-Constantinople, argue that the West uses texts which apply only to the economy to justify the eternal procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son and holds also that to deny that the procession of the Spirit is from the Father alone is to compromise the 'monarchy' of God which is the safeguard of His unity.

> For us, or rather for the Greek mind, to accept that the Son is, together with the Father, the true cause of the Holy Spirit, is equivalent to accepting two principles of divinity, something logically and psychologically impossible. [Serge, (1903) 1972,291]

Congar has, in Volume III of I Believe in the Holy Spirit attempted to deal with the problem by a detailed exposition of the development of the theology of the Third Person in East and West emphasising that while faith in the Spirit is the same in East and West the two parts of the Church approach it from somewhat different perspectives, the East's more biblical the West's more theological and rational. Congar shows with reference to many texts that the West has never denied that the Father is the absolute source of divinity. Even Augustine accepts that the Son's ability to give the Spirit comes from the Father and professes that the Spirit comes 'principaliter' from the Father (De Trinitate XV xvii; XXIX,xxvi,47) This latter conveys the idea of first and absolute source and could be translated as 'from Him as first principle' or 'originally'. [Congar 1983,III,134-135] Congar also quotes a letter from Maximus the Confessor in 655 in which he acknowledges that 'the Latins' have demonstrated that they did not make the Son the 'cause' of the Spirit and know that the Father is the only 'cause' of both Son and Spirit i.e. the absolute source of divinity.[Congar 1983,III,52]
Congar would not attribute the Schism solely to the Filioque controversy.[Congar 1959a] Indeed East and West were in communion at a time when the West was professing the Filioque, and some Eastern theologians even themselves held a procession of the Spirit through the Son, the 'per filium' of John Damascene. Congar has said that one of the strengths of Orthodox thought is its clear assertion of the interaction of the Persons. They are always affirmed together, within each

other, mutually reciprocal. "Each Person is always Trinitarian" [Congar 1983, III, 74] It is within this understanding that the 'per filium' is to be placed. Most modern Orthodox place it at the economic level but even in God 's eternity there can be said to be a procession of the common divinity to the Spirit 'through the Son'. This is not the same as the Filioque but it does give the Spirit a role in the eternal being of the Spirit. Congar believes that the Patristic texts can be understood as going beyond this but not in the sense of saying that the Spirit proceeds from the Father and the Son 'as from a single principle'. It was the theology of Photius in the ninth century which narrowed and hardened the theology of the East. [Congar 1983, III,59] He acknowledges that the procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son forms part of the Roman Catholic expression of faith in the Trinity but "it is the Latin expression of that faith." [Congar 1983,III,130.] He believes that it is a matter of theological explanation and that it is possible for other explanations of the same faith to exist " taking different insights as their point of departure and using other instruments of thought." [ibid p.131.]

5. The Holy Spirit as Gift.

Although it has been said that Congar does not set out systematically his own original understanding of who the Spirit is, he does include a 'A Theological Meditation on the Third Person ' in the third volume of I Believe in the Holy Spirit which indicates the direction of his thought.[Congar 1983, III,144-154] Having earlier considered Augustine's view of the Spirit as what is common to the Father and the Son, their shared holiness and love, "the community of both", proceeding from both but principaliter (in the first place) from the Father, Congar goes on to another of Augustine's images for the Spirit, that of "gift". There is, he believes ample Scriptural evidence for the allocation of this title to the Spirit, Acts 8,20, 2,38, 10,45 and many others, and the theme is present in the Fathers though less often in the Greek than in the Latin. [Congar 1983, III, 144-145] Although the Fathers reflected on the New Testament texts which are concerned with the Spirit as being 'given' or 'received', it is Augustine who in particular develops the theme of Gift which is also taken up by Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas. The context of Augustine's discussion of the Spirit as Gift is the difficulty which arises when one attempts to differentiate the Persons of the Trinity in terms of reciprocal relationships. What is the reciprocal relationship

which points to the hypostasis of the Spirit and how can it be that the Spirit, proceeding from the Father and the Son, can affirm two persons by reciprocal relationship ? Augustine finds the answer by using the analogy of gift. The Spirit is the Gift of the Father and the Son, they, jointly are the Giver.([De Trinitate V,xii,13) It may be objected to this that Scripture does not speak of the Father and Son as joint giver of the Spirit. David Coffey says that the Father and Christ are clearly distinguished in their respective roles as givers and so cannot be considered as constituting a single giver. [Coffey 1990, 221.]

Congar accepts that the Father and the Son are not brought together in Scripture under the one title as giver, but believes that Augustine is justified in constructing his theology of the eternal procession of the Spirit from the Father and the Son not as Father and Son but as Giver on the basis of the economic revelation and goes on to say that he found this theology "very profound." [Congar 1983,III,85.] By focusing on this theme of the Spirit as Gift he indicates that the essence of his approach is concern with salvation. This could be seen as being confirmed by his use of this particular image as the way into a linkage of the Spirit to ecclesiology. Augustine, he says, sees the Church in 'theo-logical' terms. The Spirit, eternally giveable, becomes "gift" when God brings into existence creatures to whom the donation may be made, and how he is that gift is related to who and how he is in the Trinity. So Augustine believes that

> When the Spirit is given to us he unites us to God and each other by the same principle that seals the unity of Love and Peace in God himself...he (Augustine) wants us to believe that God aims to bring us together and unite us to himself by the same Spirit who is the bond between the Father and the Son. [Congar 1983,I,80.]

Congar continues his meditation by saying that he finds the notion of the Spirit as the completion of the dynamism of the Trinitarian processions which was expressed in the formula used many times by the Greek Fathers, "From the Father, through the Son, in the Spirit" and in the theology of Basil " The Holy Spirit is connected by the one Son and by the one Father and by himself he completes the blessed Trinity" (The Holy Spirit, XVIII,45) also in the Augustinian theme of the Spirit as the link of love between the Father and the Son. The Spirit is conceived in this way of theologising as the one in whom the Father and the Son, who are relative to one another, are united. He is the one in

whom " they receive each other, in whom they communicate with one another, and in whom they rest." [Congar 1983, III, 148.] Left there it would be a static theology. Congar has indicated that he is cautious about using the theme of mutual love as grounding a Trinitarian model though he acknowledges its prayer-inspiring possibilities.[1983,I,88] However, by referring to the work of Christian Duquoc he indicates how one can use the concept of Spirit to open up the Trinity to humanity. Duquoc draws attention to the fact that God is not locked in on Himself in self-contemplation between Father and Son because He is also Spirit, creative dynamism. The Spirit "makes the divine communication open to what is not divine."[Duquoc 1977,122] He thus relates the economy to theology. Congar expresses his understanding

> He is the communion between the Father and the Son but he is first of all the Breath of God. The Son is the Image but he is first of all the Word coming from the mouth of the Father and accompanied by the Breath, and therefore accompanied by the power that sets things in motion. [Congar 1983, III,148.]

God is a 'going-forth', He is Love and Grace, and indeed the Spirit can be regarded as the hypostatisation of this Love and Grace. It is fitting that the Spirit, who is the term of the substantial communication which goes forth from the Father within the Trinity, should be connected with the continuation of this impulse when it continues " no longer by mode of substantial transference but by free and creative will" i.e. in the economy.[Congar 1983,III,148] This going out beyond Himself is not only possible for God but, because His nature is Love and Grace, it is His desire. The Spirit then is Gift, God outside Himself, God in us. Congar mentioning that Augustine says that God gives us nothing less than Himself and that this is the basis of our deification, wonders at the enormity of the promise, of the gift. He goes on to say specifically that it is the Spirit, who is the term of the communication of the divine life intra Deum, who is the principle of the communication of God outside and beyond Himself, and so to make what the Spirit is as Person, the foundation of what he is and what he does for us. [Congar 1983,III,150.] Because of the connection of the Spirit with the nature of God as love and grace, and grace being by definition free, the Spirit, like the wind blows where he wills and distributes his gifts as and where he decides. The Spirit it seems is God calling to His people and Congar sets the whole speculative

theology of the Middle Ages within the context of the prayer and sacramental life of the Church. [Congar 1983,I,104-111.]

6. The Holy Spirit as the ' Unknown One Beyond the Word.'

Congar makes special mention of this description of the Spirit which he says originated with Hans Urs Von Balthasar [Congar 1983, II, 33; von Balthasar 1967,97ff] He feels that it picks up the Scriptural sense of movement conveyed by symbols such as wind, breath, living water, fire, as well as the New Testament attribution to the Spirit of new beginnings, freedom and openness. It conveys the unity of the Word and the Spirit and the fact that the latter "acts forwards" in a time and space that has been made open by the Word.[Congar 1983,II,33.]

The Spirit makes the Christ event present, but present with the eschatological destiny in mind; he also makes Christ's Revelation present. This brings together what has happened, what has been given, once and for all in the past, with what is always new as each generation appropriates the Revelation via the preaching of the Word of God under the guidance of the Spirit, as all things proceed to their destiny in the eschatological time of which the Spirit is the sign, and, for now, the earnest. Congar will make use of these characteristics of the Spirit in his explanation of what the Spirit does in the history of the Church. Thus the concept of the Spirit as the 'Unknown One Beyond the Word', penetrating time and space, is appropriately associated with the catholicity of the Church.

From the Reformation till the Second Vatican Council it is Congar's view that though the Spirit was still present in Catholicism it had not been properly integrated with the life of the Church, being seen as either concerned with personal spirituality or as guarantor of the acts of the Church as institution. This is not pneumatology.

While Congar's consideration of who the Spirit is may be said to be derivative, it is submitted that this does not matter as, it is argued, his primary concern is to use the concept of the Spirit as a tool or a interpretative device in theology. He makes no apology for the fact that his approach is positivistic, taking Scripture and the Tradition as he finds them. It will become clear that he has grasped the importance of the integration of the theology of the Third Person with ecclesiology, with the being and work of Christ, and with the relation of all humanity, indeed all creation, to the Father. He does not discuss this in philosophical terms as does Kilian Mc Donnell for whom pneumatology is "the

universal horizon determining the interpretation of Christ and the Trinity", it has " a two- dimensional hermeneutic function" [McDonnell 1982-83, 148] In real terms however, the same intention is there. He says over and over again that there can be no separation of the work of Christ and that of the Spirit and endeavours to show how they are at work together in all areas of theology.

CHAPTER FOUR .
THE HOLY SPIRIT IN CHRISTOLOGY.

1. Congar's use of Biblical material.

2. The difficulties and advantages of a Spirit Christology.

3. Congar's Approach to a more pneumatological Christology.

CHAPTER FOUR.
THE HOLY SPIRIT IN CHRISTOLOGY.

Father Congar's interest in Spirit Christology is not to be wondered at when we consider his interest in the historical dimension of salvation, the eschatological viewpoint, the necessity of remembering that revelation of what God has done for us in Christ is for the sake of our salvation and that linked with this is the importance of the human life of Jesus Christ. These are all interests which tend towards a pneumatological Christology.

1.Congar's use of Biblical material.

An incorporation of the Spirit in Christology, if it is to be meaningful, must be grounded in the revealed reality of who Christ is in himself and likewise who the Spirit is, how Spirit and Christ are brought into relationship and how this is relevant for our salvation. There must be some quality in the Spirit which helps to explain who Christ is and which makes it appropriate that this Spirit serve as an explanation of the possibility that the results of the unique Christ-event should have a universal significance. There must also be an understanding of the Scriptural evidence as supporting the theological interpretation of the person and work of Christ in terms of the action of the Holy Spirit.

Father Congar has a preference for a theology which goes back to biblical sources, which speaks the way Scripture speaks, concretely and historically. He works on the assumption that Scripture bears witness to the revelation of God [Congar 1983, I,ix.] and assumes, in his only work on a strictly biblical theme, as his fundamental working hypothesis, the divinely inspired and divinely guaranteed character of Scripture.[Congar 1962b, ix] His approach to the use of Scripture might be termed 'spiritual' in the sense of a preference for the kind of exegesis found, by those interested in the Patristic revival, in the Greek Fathers; i.e. one approaches Scripture as a history which has a message of God's plan of salvation so that it is interpreted as a text having a significance in the light of the economy of salvation. Congar assigns to the Spirit the role of communicating the meaning of Scripture to bring about 'Christian gnosis', but as an ecclesial activity, the tradition of the Church guaranteeing the authenticity of the interpretation.[Congar 1966, 385 & 295]

In I Believe in the Holy Spirit and in The Word and the Spirit, Congar sets out the Scriptural data which form the basis for theologies of Christ and of the Spirit.

1.a.God is Word.

Congar first reflects on the Word in relation to God, i.e. in relation to the Father. In our world words, like images, are creative expressions by which human persons communicate by means of signs. As words are acts by which persons make their thoughts and feelings known to others, (and indeed to themselves) enter into relationships with them, they can be not only offers of information but ways in which " we hand over something or even the whole of ourselves and which expect an equally personal response from the other person." [Congar 1986,10.]

The word said, i.e. the sign given, depends on the one saying it, will convey something of that one. This is true not only in the human being but also in God though in an essentially different way.

> If it is a question of the word of God, we shall have many signs by which God makes Himself manifest and acts outside Himself, yet He is the one who acts.....His word ..is born of His generosity, both as inner and as external word. It is the means by which God leaves Himself, if that is a meaningful expression, and postulates beings outside Himself, that are distinct from Himself. Word and action are identical in God. In us they are two independent means of relating to others. We can act without speaking, but our word is not effective in itself. God speaks and it is. His word is effective in itself. Word - 'dabar' in Hebrew and 'logos' or 'rhema' in New Testament Greek -includes action.[Congar 1986,10]

Scripture tells us of God expressing Himself in a Word and an Image, and Paul, Colossians and Hebrews apply to Christ what the Old Testament says of Wisdom. This Logos - Image - Wisdom was always with God, turned towards Him, present not as individual towards individual but as a thought is present to the mind. The Word is the expression and image of the Father's mind " and in expressing Him he reflects His own image back to Him." [Congar 1986,10]

It is through His Logos, in Jesus Christ , that the Father freely chose to reveal Himself to the world and to heal His broken people. Congar notes that since Jesus Christ is the image of the invisible God, His wisdom, His Logos, His Son, this roots the redemptive mystery of the cross in God Himself. He mentions, the difficulty inherent in this theme but does not elaborate simply saying

> let us remember that the Logos is, in the eternal present of God, conceived incarnandus, primogenitus in multibus fratribus, crucificiendus ...primogenitus omnis creaturae, glorificandus...[Congar 1986,11.]

This, taken with what Congar has said about the plan of God, indicates that he sees the whole enterprise of creation and redemption as a unity, the economy of grace co-present with natural and human history, but being progressively revealed. So when the mystery of Christ, which is intimately united with God the Father Himself, is presented in the New Testament it embraces past and future, creation and the inauguration of the new eschatological creation, and will be creative word when it is received with faith.
It is at the very beginning of the salvific enterprise that Congar sets the intervention of the Spirit.

1.b.The involvement of the Spirit.

In the light of what has been said in Chapter Three about Congar's understanding of the Holy Spirit we can conclude that there is a quality of limitlessness about the Spirit which makes it appropriate that through him the redemption of Christ should be opened up to all. It is a pre-requisite of a Spirit Christology that there should be just such a grounding of the role of the Spirit in the universalising of Christ, in the Spirit as he is in Himself, and that this Spirit should be seen to be involved in the very constitution of Christ as Word made flesh for us. Only in this way can the relationship of Word and Spirit be explained in such a manner as to nullify the charge that the Spirit is simply brought in as a mysterious force to make explicable the inexplicable - how the work of Jesus attains its universality and is assimilated by individuals.
Since the Word is the Word of God, of the Father, and the Spirit is the Spirit of God and since both reveal Him and lead to Him it is to be expected that they will be linked. Indeed

" Scripture...from Genesis to Revelation, from the first to the last verse, bears witness to the intimate connection between the Word and the Spirit." [Congar 1986,19.]

Word and Spirit do the work of God, which is the bringing of all to Himself. This is accomplished when by word God communicates with His people. God speaks and the people are expected to listen, to obey. (Jer.7,23, 11,4: Deut.6,4) Congar explains that Hebrew uses 'hear' for 'obey' and that the Latin verb oboedire comes from audire -"obedience is defined as hearing." [Congar 1986,22.] Ex.19,5 makes obedience to the voice of God the centre of the covenant. It is not however simply by obedience to the word given that we reach our eternal inheritance. The law does not make us free. The promise made by God to Abraham was connected with his faith, and the fulfilment of that promise , the gift of the Spirit, is also connected with faith. (Gal.3,14) Paul links faith with obedience, (R.1,5. & 16,26) drawing our attention to the necessity of distinguishing the way we come to respond to the will of God from the way in which we attain our secular learning. Our reception of the saving word is conditioned by an inner disposition in us. Congar quotes Aquinas's dictum that it is only by the Holy Spirit that we can understand the teaching presented by the word. [Congar 1986,12.] He distinguishes therefore, between an inner and an external word and quotes Aquinas as speaking of " that inner speech by which God speaks to us through inner inspiration." [Congar 1986 ,22,36.] He does say also that tradition tends to speak more of an 'inner master' enabling us to understand external words. Whatever terms we use, it is the Holy Spirit who is attested as performing the function of bringing us to understanding -(R15,18-19) Congar also refers to 1 Pet.1,12 and Heb.2,3-4 as evidence of the co-activity of the Holy Spirit in the process of the dissemination of the word of God.

> The glorified Lord and the Spirit do the same work. The unity of the glorified Christ and the Spirit is functional, that is to say it is an operative unity. The work to be done in believers is common to both of them and the two 'hands proceeding from the Father do conjointly whatever the Father, who is Love, wishes to do. When Christians speak of this they do so both in terms of the inner Word or Wisdom and in terms of the Holy Spirit. Paul joins the two together under the name of the Lord, who became a 'life-giving Spirit.' [Congar 1986,25.]

It is through the Spirit , by faith and baptism, that the redemption of Christ is opened up to all .Though children by adoption and not by substance we receive a communication from God by His Spirit which truly enables us to be of one mind with Christ - Phil.2,5.- without our in some way being absorbed into the deity. Congar quotes R.8,14,15 in support of this understanding, that though there is a dynamism given by the Spirit it is we who continue to act - 'All who are **led** by the Spirit of God are sons of God .'[Congar 1983,I,32.] So it is **we**, who like Mary, keep the word faithfully, it is **we** who under the guidance of the Spirit are nourished by the truth of the Word.

What is true of us as individuals is also true of us as Church. Congar believes that " the Spirit who moved Christ and the Apostles to utter their words .... still moves the Church, the structured People of God, to keep and meditate on them." [Congar 1986,29.] It is only within the community of the Church that we can be assured of the rightness of our interpretation of the vision of God to which Scripture witnesses.

This approach signals an adherence to the Patristic and Mediaeval approach to Scripture in which the revelatory word is understood within the whole ecclesial tradition, so that, for example, the truth about Christ can be grasped only in the light of faith. Such an approach does not necessarily negate the historical/critical method. Indeed the latter is necessary as a corrective of possible flights of fancy, to which spiritual exegesis could be prone, by keeping to the fore the literal sense of the text. The believing historian looks at the same data as the secular historian as both search for the literal meaning of the text. For the former, however, this meaning includes what the author intended to communicate, his faith-experience, the reconstruction of which is itself part of the historical quest, but this can only be properly understood by those who can share that experience from within. This is the line of thought in the Pontifical Biblical Commission's document on Bible and Christology published in 1984. Father Congar stresses however that the study of the texts and their editing is important to avoid the danger of attributing all statements of Jesus about himself and his mission to the faith of his disciples and to preserve the truth that they were **transmitting** the witness of Jesus himself.[Congar 1966,6.] So, by the Spirit, within the Church, the written testimony of God is meditated upon and understood but " the testimony of the Holy Spirit always sends us back to the historical testimony." [Congar 1986,25: Dupuy 1970,96]

The reality is that the Church is born of the Word. (In this section of the Word

and the Spirit, pp.26ff, Congar shows his knowledge of and sympathy with the thought of Luther.) It not only has its genesis by virtue of the Word but is ever called to the obedience of faith to that Word and has a certain relationship of identity with the Word, with Christ. So Paul can speak of the Church as if it were Christ, I Cor.12,12, and gives the words of God at his conversion as " Saul, Saul, why do you persecute me?" From such beginnings there has grown up the tradition that the Church is the bearer of the truth, the word, by which she lives, the culmination of the movement from the concept of the Church as bearer of what is handed down, passive tradition, to that of active tradition "which is the means of transmission and is to all intents and purposes the Church's magisterium. It has almost led to a replacement of the principle 'the Church believes because it is revealed' by 'it is revealed because the Church believes' and even 'because the Church's magisterium says so.'" [Congar 1986,28.] He goes on to say that Pius X11 could even say that the Church ' under the guidance and protection of the Holy Spirit, is its own source of truth' [ibid p.28] Father Congar refutes this approach and holds that

> The magisterium is a channel by which revelation is presented to the faithful with the value of a rule of faith. It is not itself a source, save in the apostles, and then by virtue of a charism which has not been transmitted to the inheritors of their ministry.[Congar 1966,205.]

He understands that, in spite of the fact that there is now a much greater understanding in the Reformed churches of the meaning of Tradition within the Catholic Church, and that Calvin himself, for example, acknowledged the need of the " common ministry of the Church " as a counterweight to excessive individualism, (Commentary on Eph.4,11-12) there is still the difficulty that the Roman Catholic Church may be seen as finding its norm within itself in the person of the Pope.[Congar 1986,33.]
Congar's understanding is that it is the task of the Church, by virtue of her tradition, and by the work of the Holy Spirit, to keep and teach the word of God. It was the Spirit who inspired the scriptural authors, the Spirit who will teach all truth and will point to Christ.

> The Spirit proceeds from the Father as the Spirit of truth and the glorified Christ sends him from the Father so that in and through the Church, he

> may bear witness to Jesus. Through the Spirit-truth the truth brought by Jesus is made present and active in the Church. [Congar 1986,30.]

Scripture can be shown to witness to the essential functional connection of Word and Spirit as they together bring about the good purpose of the Father.

Congar's use of Scripture can be summed up as a belief that it is possible to return to the patristic way, that of reading Scripture 'in the Spirit', while still making use of the methods and resources of modern scholarship in exegesis. He would agree with Ignace de la Potterie's view that one must use the best possible methods to understand the texts and then find within them the spiritual sense, the penetration of what was written for believers by inspired believers, i.e." Literal exegesis must open itself, deepen itself, broaden itself, to become spiritual interpretation." [de la Potterie 1986,325.]

The latest document of the Pontifical Biblical Commission, The Interpretation of the Bible in the Church, 1993, sets out that the biblical texts will require continued use of the historico-critical method and adds that " the synchronic approaches (the rhetorical, narrative, semiotic and others) are capable ... of bringing about a renewal of exegesis and making a very useful contribution." Spiritual exegesis can go on within any advances made in critical scholarship.

2. Difficulties and advantages of a Spirit Christology.

For most of the centuries of Christianity the way in which belief in the unique, redemptive, Jesus of Nazareth has been expressed has been in terms of his coming down from the Father to live as man among men and women. "The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." The Christology of the Prologue to the Gospel of John , that of a pre-existent Logos descending, becoming incarnate in Jesus of Nazareth, has seemed to many to be the best means of explaining the uniqueness of this person through whom salvation is claimed to be offered to all. However this is not the only, or indeed the earliest, way in which the unique relationship of Jesus to the Father has been expressed.

In the New Testament as well as the Logos Christology, there is to be found one in which the concept of Jesus as the Son of the Father is enough to represent his unique status - the main part of the gospel of John - and also a Spirit Christology in which Jesus is represented as one full of the Holy Spirit. In addition the descending incarnation Christology is paralleled by an elevation or ascending Christology.

The Christologies of Paul and Luke are the most explicitly pneumatic, but the Spirit has a role also in the Christology and eschatology of the Gospel of John and the other Synoptic Gospels. This has come to be more widely recognised as theologians have come to realise the importance of the fact that the early church associated the person of Jesus with the promise of Yahweh to pour out His Spirit on all flesh.(Acts 2,17-25.)

> it is precisely this essential link between Spirit theology and eschatology which links what have rightly been called the two divergent strands of Spirit theology in the Bible: the Old Testament stress on the Spirit of Yahweh as His life-giving, eschatological power and the New Testament's emphasis on the Spirit as the Spirit of Jesus who now directs, aids, teaches and fills the eschatological community of the Church. [Rosato 1977, 425.]

In the Old Testament the coming of the Spirit to all is to be the sign of the fulfilment of Yahweh's promise i.e. it is in the context of the Spirit that the eschatological act of God is set. So when the New Testament sets Jesus in this same pneumatological context it proclaims that in him God has performed an

eschatological act and links the latter definitively with the former.

Rosato believes that from Orthodoxy through Protestantism to Roman Catholicism there is a movement towards pneumatological insights in the field of systematic theology, the way having been prepared by the groundwork of the exegetes and the historians, and in particular thinks that " cross-disciplinary studies are converging on the most ancient of Christologies, the Pneuma-sarx Christology of early Jewish Christianity."[Rosato 1977,429.]

The way ahead, however, may not be simple. Throughout the history of the Church there have been difficulties with Spirit theology. At times it has brought rejuvenation, at times schism. So warning notes sound when one begins to deal with the problems concerning the relation of the Spirit with Christ, with the individual or with the Church. In the specific case of Spirit Christology, though it is present in the New Testament and in Jewish Christianity, e.g. in the Shepherd of Hermas, it soon moves to the periphery of orthodoxy as incarnation Christology becomes predominant after the time of the Apologists.

Early Christianity had to wrestle with the difficulty of trying to develop a theology, a Christology, which could bring together the salvific function of Jesus and his personal nature, in Chalcedonian terms his uniqueness in being both God and man. Paul reflects the difficulty in his Pneuma-sarx Christology of R.1,3-4. " Jesus Christ was descended from David according to the flesh and was designated Son of God in power according to the Spirit of holiness by his resurrection from the dead", a two-stage Christology which can also be found in Phil.2,6-11 and 1 Pet.3,18.

The experience of the post-Resurrection community, filled with the Spirit, led it to be primarily concerned with the fact that the crucified Jesus is the Risen Lord. There are these two stages, that of the sarx, the natural man, and that of the pneuma, the spirit, through which the Son of God passed. That this passing was given a soteriological meaning is clear when we link the above with Paul's statements in Gal.4,4. and R.8,9. and connect the two-stages with the great exchange taking place for our salvation. (2Cor.8,9) In Jesus of Nazareth flesh and spirit are united and heaven and earth are brought together and the earliest attempt to give meaning to the who and the why of this was in terms of the Spirit/Flesh, Pneuma/Sarx. Jesus was unique because of the way in which he was united to the Spirit of Yahweh. As well as in the New Testament this is also found in Ignatius of Antioch's Letter to the Ephesians,7,2.

The danger with this approach is that it can be interpreted in an Adoptionist

sense. It could be taken that the Spirit came upon the man Jesus at some point and operated in him because of some special qualities which he had. Thus in the adoptionist Christology of the Ebionites Jesus is seen as the new Moses, sent to re-establish the covenant, and the divine Spirit whose presence can be traced from Adam to Moses, from the prophets to Jesus, was in him in a special way. On Jesus, though he was born a man, son of Mary and Joseph, the Spirit of the True Prophet came to rest for ever when it descended upon him at his baptism . It was at that moment that he was adopted as the true Messiah who would return in glory.

In this Christology both Jesus and the Spirit of the True Prophet are agents of Yahweh, but inferior to Him - important to the Ebionites who wanted to maintain their strict adherence to monotheism. Though by accepting Jesus as the True prophet the Ebionites set themselves apart from Judaism, the fact that they saw him as the True Prophet adopted by the Spirit of Yahweh cut them off from Trinitarian Christian orthodoxy.

The weakness of Spirit Christology - basically the denial of the ontological significance of Jesus of Nazareth - was so exaggerated that it gradually disappeared from mainstream Christianity, and Christology came to be focused on the hypostatic union of the Word with the human Jesus of Nazareth.

As a result attention rested less on the baptism of Jesus and ever more on the incarnation. It is within this incarnational christology that the great heresies arose and against them the Church's teachings were laid down in credal form at Nicea and Constantinople. The divinity and pre-existence of the Christ who was confessed as " true God from true God" were assumed from Scripture and were interpreted in particular with reference to the Gospel of John, especially the Prologue. It was only later, at Chalcedon, that the way in which the eternal Son and the human Jesus were related, was worked out. This was done in terms of the "hypostatic union" of the two natures, human and divine, in Christ . The two natures are not confused or divided, rather the human nature exists in its particular way by being sustained by the person of the eternal Word, who does not replace any part of the humanity of Jesus but acts through his total humanity. The Council did not, however, answer the question of how the humanity maintained its reality if it subsisted in a divine personality.

This Christology of Chalcedon, in spite of the fact that it is concerned with human salvation and not simply with metaphysical speculation, manages without using the concept of the Holy Spirit. Yet it has been noted that Congar said that

there can be no Christology without pneumatology. It must be said that the Council of Chalcedon did not follow the structure of salvation history but focused on one aspect of it - the meaning of the person of Christ, his ontology as it affected our salvation. The significance, the particularity, of Jesus is expressed by the fact that the Word of God united himself personally (hypostatically) with him ensuring that it is one and the same who is both human and divine and therefore, by this very fact, able to open up for us the way to God. The terms 'person' and 'hypostasis' are not defined and the explanation of the union is in negative terms - " without confusion, without change, without division, without separation." According to Walter Kasper

> Compared with the total Christological witness of Scripture the Christological dogma of Chalcedon represents a contraction. The dogma is exclusively concerned with the inner constitution of the divine and human subject. It separates this question from the total context of Jesus' history and fate, from the relation in which Jesus stands, not only to the Logos but to 'his Father', and we miss the total eschatological perspective of biblical theology.[Kasper 1977, 238.]

It is because Congar believes that the way of theology should be from the economy, from what Scripture reveals for us and for our salvation, that he is against a consideration of the ontological in isolation from what Jesus did for us in history, and wishes to make some addition to traditional Christology - the greater involvement of the Spirit in it.

According to P.J.A.M. Schoonenberg the Logos came to be understood as uniting himself substantially with the human reality of Jesus - Jesus human substance in Scholastic terms - whereas the work of the Spirit was to supply the accidental, the created gift of habitual grace which follows the grace of union, which is the hypostatic union itself. [Schoonenberg 1977, 350-375.] He goes on to say that even this working of the Spirit comes to be obscured with the rise of the Scholastic doctrine of appropriations " whereby the operations of Father Son and Holy Spirit are not only inseparably common to all of them - which always was a Christian doctrine - but...are **indistinctly** common, belonging to each of the three persons on the same title and in the same way, or rather belonging to the Trinity as one principle.."[ibid.p.355.]

The end result of this whole process, whereby first the anointing of Jesus was

extended to the incarnation and sometimes attributed to the Logos, second the influence of the Spirit became accidental in comparison with that of the Logos and finally was considered to be not properly his own but simply attributed to him, says Schoonenberg, " is that we are far removed from Holy Scripture and also from many of the church fathers, especially the Greeks."[Schoonenberg 1977,355.] This would be in line with Congar's thinking but he, in wishing to re-formulate a Christology based on the intervention of the Holy Spirit, is not seeking to contradict or supplant but rather to supplement the classic Christology based on the incarnate Word. [Congar 1983,III,165.]

Rosato, points out that though the so-called Christology of the Ebionites, a version of Spirit Christology, in fact by-passes the particularity of Jesus in order to emphasise the power and absolute transcendence of the Father and man's universal participation in grace through the Spirit, it also makes a positive contribution to dogmatic theology. It is essentially biblical rather than philosophical and has important eschatological and soteriological emphases.[Rosato 1977,435]

This is why in spite of the great danger of an Adoptionist interpretation, that Christ is interpreted as divine functionally rather than ontologically, the advantages have prompted theologians to attempt to revive Spirit christology .

First of all it is Scriptural. Kasper in Jesus the Christ argues convincingly that the New Testament inserts Jesus into the framework of biblical pneumatology with the intention of upholding both his uniqueness and his universal character. A Spirit Christology sets Jesus in the context of the Spirit of Yahweh present in the Judges, Kings and Prophets of the Old Testament. The Ebionites were right to see Jesus the Messiah in line with the Spirit filled figures of Judaism.[Kasper 1977,254ff.] Rosato agrees with this and says, in addition, that the biblical/pneumatological context " rightly highlighted the notion of Jesus as the new creation who was hovered over and breathed upon by the same creative Spirit of Yahweh who brooded over the chaos in Gen.1,2. Such a pneumatic perspective offered Christology not only biblical profundity but also cosmic validity."[Rosato 1977,436.] Schoonenberg also wants to introduce more Biblical theology into dogmatics in this area since he " finds it intolerable that a main theme of Paul's, Luke's and even John's christology remains either banished from our theological treatises or confined to some scholion." [Schoonenberg 1977,360.] Congar, in his turn, insists that, though it is important to avoid Adoptionism, we must as believers "accord the New Testament texts their full

realism." [Congar 1983,III,171.]

Secondly, the Spirit approach to Christology emphasises the Trinitarian aspect of salvation and gives due weight to the function of the individual Persons, something which, Logos Christology tends not to do.

It is a theological datum that when God acts ad extra it is the Trinity, Father, Son and Spirit, which acts. Why should it matter that we give the Spirit a role? Although when the Trinity acts , its actions are undivided, they are not undifferentiated. [Congar 1983,III,11f.] Congar would follow Rahner in believing that the ways in which God communicates himself to us in the economy corresponds to something real in the way in which He subsists as Persons. He quotes The Trinity, " There is only one outward activity of God, exerted and possessed as one and the same by Father, Son and Spirit, according to the peculiar way in which each possesses the God-head." [Congar 1983, III,12,13: Rahner 1970,76] Thus it is not correct to say that any of the Persons could have become man. Nor would it be true to say that each of the three Persons has only an appropriated relationship to us, a relationship which would tell us nothing about God as He is in Himself. Rather each has a proper relationship to the human individual - the Trinity which we experience in the history of salvation is the Trinity as it is in itself.

Congar would, however, in some ways limit the absoluteness of Rahner's axiom that the economic Trinity is the immanent Trinity and vice-versa. He has doubts about identifying what he calls the 'necessary mystery of the Tri-unity of God' with the 'free mystery' of the economy. God would still have existed without His creation. Creation is an act of free will whereas the procession of the Persons took place in accordance with nature " according to Athanasius"[Congar 1983.III,13] Congar questions also whether we can assume that God reveals the whole of His mystery in the economic communication. [Congar 1983,III,13.]

Be that as it may, he accepts Rahner's teaching that there is only one outward communication of God, but as it is carried out by each Person, it is carried out according to the way in which that Person possesses divinity.[Congar 1983, III,13] So the fact that it was the Son who became incarnate tells us something of the Son. In him God enters history. The Spirit is not incarnate as is the Son. He does not become history but opens up history to God - his function is, according to Rahner " the opening up of history into the immediacy of its fatherly origin and end." [Rahner 1970,47.] and in the words of Congar "to open up the paths of the gospel in time and space." [Congar 1973,24.]

It is important, therefore, that this characteristic of the Spirit should be recognised as having a function in the economy of salvation in which he acts with the Father and the Son. Spirit Christology more than the later Logos Christologies, made way for the soteriological aspect of the Christ event. Logos Christology, with its one-sided ontological emphasis, tended to separate christology from salvation history and from a theology of grace. Rahner pointed to the danger of separating the eternal being of God from His historical activity and Congar agrees wholeheartedly.

This leads to the third, but related, reason for involving the Spirit in Christology. It helps to make more comprehensible the how of the mediation of God which takes place through the Spirit and which has as its purpose the final reuniting of all humanity with Him. Congar believes in the importance of remembering that salvation is a history, it takes place in time and through time and, as has been evidenced by his endorsement of Rahner, in connecting this historical activity of God with what God is in Himself. The Spirit as the out-reach of God, as the one who opens up history, draws attention to the fact that the salvation brought about in Christ is brought about in time. The Spirit is also the one who makes it possible that the acts of Jesus have universal significance because it was the Spirit acting in Christ in his life death and resurrection, who made him Son in the sense of first-born son of grace and it is the same Spirit who enables us to be sons thereafter.

Finally the eschatological point is relevant. The re-union of God with human-kind will be eschatological and Jesus, as the one filled with the Spirit, is proclaimed as the bringer of God's final word. Biblical thought awaited the coming of the Spirit as the sign that the time of the Lord had come. The Spirit was to be poured out on all humanity, and as Acts 2, 17ff. shows, this was understood to have come about in Jesus of Nazareth. In the letters of Paul also it is evident that with the coming of Jesus Christ the Spirit was deemed to have become present in the community and the time of salvation to have arrived. This is important for Congar with his understanding that the order of creation and that of grace are a unity in that they both depend, in the unity of the Divine Plan, on the lordship of Christ. It is through Christ that God brings about the fulfilment of His design for all humanity, and indeed for all creation, a design of redemption foreseen from the very moment of creation. Even though that lordship will only be fully exercised eschatologically, the arrival of the Spirit in and with and through Christ is the guarantee of our eschatological inheritance. A pneumatological Christology,

therefore, by placing Jesus in the eschatological setting with the use of the concept of the Spirit of God, would not only take into account one of the emphases of Pauline Christology, but would accord with Congar's own insights. With the decline of the importance ascribed to the Spirit and the loss of the view of Jesus as eschatologically significant for all people, the forward looking perspective, that of hope, was lost. Rosato sums up " Spirit Christology maintained, more than Logos Christology ever could, the eschatological, temporal and universal character of the person of Christ." [Rosato 1977,436.]

3. Congar's Approach to a more Pneumatological Christology.

[To be found principally in I Believe in the Holy Spirit, Volume Three, pp.165-173 " and in The Word and the Spirit, Ch.6, pp.85-100]

Father Congar does not approach the role of the Spirit in Christology specifically from the biblical basis of the earliest Christologies, from the understanding that " the mediation between God and man in Jesus Christ can be understood theologically only as an event 'in the Holy Spirit' "[Kasper 1977,249.] He comes to this understanding by way of dissatisfaction with traditional Christology. He implicitly criticises the neo-Thomist approach when he says that one of the greatest disasters of modern Catholicism was when it concentrated on God and religion 'as they are in themselves' instead of continuing to inquire what they mean for men and women. The result of this development in which God and world are separated is that human beings respond by getting along without God. [Congar 1966a,11] The reaction to such an approach in the particular area of the study of Christ has been for theologians to reduce Christology to anthropology seen especially, according to Walter Kasper, in the Bultmann school, in Hans Kung and possibly in Schillebeeckx. [Kasper 1989,75] Congar emphatically does not go down this road. Though his views may indicate a less than radical approach to christological pneumatology in that he does not seek to overturn the traditional approach, by giving a place to the Spirit, a necessary or constitutive place, he provides values missing in the incarnational approach. He is not primarily concerned with going into the questions of how the christological concepts of 'nature' and 'person', the soteriological concepts of 'sacrifice' and 'atonement' and so on can be meaningfully interpreted for the modern world, but rather with the relation of the ontological in Christ to the functional statements

about his meaning for us. Though a Thomist, Congar acknowledges that he came to find the Christology of Aquinas unsatisfactory, not because it ignored the life of Christ and the fact that his coming was for us and for our salvation, but because, by its descending character, its concentration on the Incarnation, it neglects the aspect of re-ascent, i.e. the question of how it effects our redemption and had difficulty in making the human life of Christ salvifically meaningful.[Congar 1986,86]

All incarnational christologies face this difficulty of integrating the significance of the full divinity and full humanity in Jesus with the tendency being to downgrade the humanity, to fail to allow Jesus to grow and to act as an authentic human person. There tends to develop a theology of Christ separated from the human Jesus which can itself lead to a reactive study of the historical Jesus who is less than divine. The connection between Jesus and the Christ is lost. There is a dualism in the theologising. As a corollary to this difficulty in fully integrating the humanity of one who is God incarnate, the historical economy of salvation loses its importance. This, Congar believes, must be avoided. It was as the human Jesus of Nazareth that Christ carried out his saving mission, acting consciously and freely, and it is in this very action that the Holy Spirit is involved. The economy of salvation is historical in character. There are certain kairoi, times favourable for a particular event, when new things actually happened. [Congar 1986, 86-87.]

In the New Testament Congar believes that there is evidence of successive comings of the Spirit over Jesus as he is Saviour, historical stages which were " authentic qualitative moments in which God's communication of Himself in Jesus Christ, and in a very real sense also to Jesus Christ, was accomplished. There were successive comings of the Holy Spirit over Jesus Christ in his quality as Saviour." [Congar 1986,87.]

The Spirit is first involved in the conception of Jesus. At the very beginning of the Economy the Spirit is there. In Scholastic theology the purpose of the Spirit is to make the humanity of Jesus holy. He is ontologically Son of God by the hypostatic union and because of that is the temple of the Holy Spirit. [see Schoonenberg's comments above] Congar explains that Aquinas spoke in terms of the grace of the union - the hypostatic union - having as its consequence, from the very moment of Christ's conception, created, sanctifying, grace.[Congar 1986,86: 1983,III,166.] Aquinas is essentially concerned with the ontology of the incarnate Word and though created grace pre-supposes at its source, the presence

of the Holy Spirit, Uncreated Grace, Thomas concentrated on the concept of created sanctifying grace totally filling Christ with the fullness of holiness.

Congar, because he is concerned not only with the inner being of the God-Man, but also with his relation to us, to history, sees the role of the Spirit as doing more than make holy the humanity of Jesus who is ontologically Son of God by the hypostatic union. While it is true that Jesus is Son by eternal begetting, (Ps.2,7.) Congar believes that we must consider how this applies to history. It is in the historical context that the salvation of humanity takes place. The Spirit is involved at the conception of Jesus because he is involved in the creation of the very being of Jesus as Son for us. The pneumatological element, therefore, unites Father Son and Spirit in the initiation of the unitary act of redemption and is connected with the nature of the Spirit.

It is submitted that Congar has in mind, though he does not explain here the origin of his thought, the function and being of the Holy Spirit as he is in himself. In 'A theological meditation on the Third Person' we can see that for Congar the Holy Spirit is above all Gift. [Congar 1983, III, Ch.3,2]This preference ties in with Father Congar's ever-present concern with God-in-relation, to the world, to His creation, especially to humanity. The Spirit is the one who is given so that men and women might become ' the community of the sons (and daughters) of God.' He is the content of the promise of the Father and, already given to us, is the earnest money of our eschatological inheritance. Though Jesus is also given to us, " it is only the Holy Spirit who is called Gift. " [Congar 1983, III,144.] He says there is abundant evidence for this in Scripture and in the writings of the Fathers of the East and the West.[ibid]

Expounding the mystery of the Spirit as absolute Gift Congar, as has been said in Chapter Three supra, turns to the formula used by the Greek Fathers and incorporated in their doxologies - 'from the Father, through the Son, in the Holy Spirit' - and finds in them a truth of the economic order, but one expressing the order of the immanent Trinity, that "the Spirit is the one through whom God's communication of himself is completed." [Congar 1983,III,147.] In the economy Congar understands that Spirit as " the one who completes all things and who brings a perfection in which we can rest in peace." [Congar 1983,III,144.] He finds this confirmed in Basil, Augustine and Richard of St. Victor and in the modern theologies of Kasper and Mühlen . He quotes the former as saying that " the Spirit is the bond of unity not only in God , but also between God and creation" and the latter as asserting that " the Pneuma is God's being outside

himself" [Congar 1983, III, 149 & 154n.35]

In addition, because the ability of the Holy Spirit to sanctify is one of his characteristic properties - Basil calls him " the perfecting cause" (On the Holy Spirit, XV1,38) - and since he is also love, it is not simply that God **can** exist outside Himself as Pneuma, but He desires to do so." God is love and He is Grace. Love and Grace are hypostasized in the Spirit." [Congar 1983,III,149.]

It makes sense, following this line of reasoning to involve the Spirit in the conception of Jesus. The one who is 'God's being outside himself' must surely be involved at the very moment of God's supreme inter-action with creation - the self-giving of God in Jesus, true Son, true God, and also true man. According to Vladimir Lossky, John Damascene, summing up the Christological doctrine of the Fathers, said that the Incarnation was accomplished by the Holy Spirit who " caused the Virgin to be fit to receive in her the Deity of the Word" as well as by the Word himself who formed in her "the first-fruits of his humanity."[Lossky 1957,141]

Congar certainly makes the Spirit the agent of Christ's economic Sonship, that is as Son not from the point of view of his hypostatic quality or ontology, but from the point of view of the Divine Plan of grace. It would be possible to go further than that and to say with Walter Kasper that " The sanctification of Jesus by the Spirit and his gifts is not merely an adventitious consequence of the sanctification by the Logos through the hypostatic union, but its pre-supposition." [Kasper 1977, 251.] i.e. it is because the Spirit who is freedom, love, grace, totally fills the humanity of Jesus that it can be the receptacle for the self-communication of God. Congar also tries to give a role to the Holy Spirit in the very creation of the humanity with which the Word unites himself hypostatically.

> What is known as the hypostatic union is, as a work ad extra, the action of the Three Persons... It is however the Spirit who, by activating in Mary her capacity as a woman to conceive (and thereby supplying the 23 male chromosomes) produces the human being whom the Son, the Word, unites to himself, and thereby the 'holy' fact. In this way Jesus is Emmanuel, God with us, because he was of the Holy Spirit (and conceived by that Spirit.) That is dogmatically and theologically the meaning of Luke 1,35. [Congar 1983,I,25,n.6.]

Again,

> When the Holy Spirit made Mary's capacity as a woman to be a mother active in her, what he did was to bring about in her a humanity which the Father was truthfully to address with the words 'You are my beloved Son'. [Congar 1983,II, 213.]

Leaving aside the wisdom of going into the biological detail, (which seems to suggest a composite 'God-man' and indicates the difficulty one faces when one asks the scientific question, where do the Y chromosomes in Jesus come from, within a theology professing a virgin birth) from the point of view of the involvement of the Spirit this seems to approximate to Kasper's position above. If the Spirit is involved in making the humanity of Jesus holy and such that it is able to be assumed by the Logos, does this not mean that the Spirit is involved in the creation of the very being of the God/Man? True the hypostatic union is, as Congar says, the personal act of the Word/Son, yet he also says that the Spirit caused "a son's soul and a son's love " to arise in that first human beginning. Does it matter? Yes, because if the Spirit is involved in the very constitution of Jesus Christ he brings to the essence of the God/ Man all that we have said that he is as Spirit, and belongs to Jesus in such a way that when he is given by the Risen Lord what is experienced in the gift of the Spirit is that Lord.

Congar, it seems, wants to look at the process of the Incarnation from two different angles. In terms of a theology based on the Prologue to the gospel of John, according to which the Word (with the Father and the Spirit) created and joined himself to the humanity of Jesus of Nazareth; and from the point of view of an ascending Christology whereby the Spirit (again with the Father and the Son) created, and so sanctified the humanity of which we speak that it could become the resting place of the Word. He is concerned with the involvement of the Spirit rather than with which Person has priority, in this he is inclined to follow the order of the processions. Congar's work, thus understood, provides an inclusive approach which tries to show that the different Christological insights are complementary rather than opposed to one another. It may be said that it echoes Scripture itself for there the idea of the Spirit as constituting the very identity of the Christ co-exists with the notion of the Spirit as given, and only able to be given, by the Risen Christ and both types of Christology, ascending and descending, are to be found in the New Testament.

There are times other than the Incarnation, in the life of Jesus, Congar says, when

the Spirit comes upon Jesus in new, decisive, ways, but ways connected again with his relationship to humanity.

The first of these times is at the baptism of Jesus. It was at his baptism - which Congar interprets as a theophany of the Trinity - that Jesus was declared to be the Son of God, the chosen one. This was done according to Luke,3,22, in the words of Psalm 2,7 which calls to mind royal messianism. Matthew and Mark combine this with some words from Isiah 42,1, which refers to the Suffering Servant. In addition to the voice from Heaven, the Spirit is portrayed as descending in the form of a dove.

This descent of the Spirit is said by Congar to mark the beginning of the messianic era. It is an anointing of Jesus by the Spirit which makes him the Messiah, the Christ. It was not, as Aquinas thought, a manifestation of something which already existed. It was not that the event changed what Jesus was in himself, what he had always been, the only-begotten Son, but it introduced something new into the economy of salvation.[Congar 1983, III,167.]

This suggests that Congar views the baptismal anointing of Jesus as pre-supposing the person of Jesus as constituted by the hypostatic union, consubstantial with the Father according to his divinity and consubstantial with us according to his humanity, and then understands that person in a developing relationship with creation. This takes place, within an understanding of the life and work of Jesus Christ as the way of kenosis, by means of a developing filial relationship of prayer and obedience which is the work of the Spirit. It is therefore through a personal relationship that the Father is acting as He constitutes the Son as the Christ.

Congar speaks of the baptismal descent of the Spirit on Jesus in terms of 'anointing'.[Congar 1983,III,167; 1986,87] This notion was used by Matthias Scheeben to explain the pneumatological component in the Incarnation. The Spirit, who proceeds from the Son, enters with him the humanity of Jesus and anoints it with the Logos' own divinity. Ultimately the source is in the Father but the Spirit is involved in the anointing (though subordinately to the Logos) and so in the bringing about of the being of the God/Man.[Scheeben 1947, 332-333] This is more than the Thomistic view of the Logos adorning his own humanity with the fullness of the Spirit proceeding from him.

Heribert Mühlen also uses the concept of anointing but associates it with the baptism of Jesus rather than with his Incarnation. It is this approach which Congar follows and he refers, as does Muhlen, to the work of Ignace de la

Potterie.

> There is no text in the New Testament which refers to the anointing of Christ at the moment of his incarnation. According to the patristic and theological tradition the hypostatic union is a consecration of Jesus' humanity by his divinity, but this idea cannot be found in any of the new Testament authors.[Congar 1983,I,28,n33: de la Potterie, 1958,250]

This exegete maintains that the baptismal anointing is a prophetic anointing of Jesus and refers to the function of Christ, not his being or nature. Congar follows this line and interprets the baptismal anointing as "a new act in which the divine sonship was made present - the act that made him and declared him to be the 'Christ'" [Congar 1986,88]

Congar indicates that this baptismal anointing has, as its agent, the Holy Spirit.[Congar 1983,III,167] It brought something new for us, the Messiahship of Jesus, and though it did not change what Jesus was, it added nothing new to his ontology, it changed Jesus understanding of himself and his mission, his understanding of himself as saving victim. His consciousness of being Son and Servant was extended, so that he could express it in a new way. Similarly, at other times in his life, during the temptations, while he was at prayer, the Spirit was involved in such a way as to develop Jesus's consciousness of himself and his work. Immediately after his baptism the Spirit leads him to begin his messianic work. After the temptations Jesus began his preaching and proclaimed that "The time is fulfilled and the Kingdom of God is at hand."(Mark,1,15)

To the attitude of filial obedience and love formed by the human heart of Jesus, by the dispositions of his will, was added an intuitive religious knowledge of God, given by the Spirit. Luke,(10,21-22) links the Spirit with the consciousness which Jesus had of his sonship. There was a communication of the meaning of the Fatherhood of God, and of his special relationship with the Father. It was because he had a fuller understanding of what it meant to be Father that he could reveal God to us. He could add to the conventional attribution of power to Fatherhood, the newer insights of mercy and love.

> It was necessary that there be some irruption in him of the light of the creative Word for him to know, at the level of his human consciousness, the revelatory value, the power to reveal God, possessed by the images of

which he like us was aware.[Congar 1966b,64.]

From his studies Congar's conclusion is that Jesus is Son in several ways. He is Son by eternal begetting. He is the Monogenitus. However, if we are to take seriously the fact that the economy of salvation is a historical process, we must give due weight to the texts which indicate that at different times in his life Jesus becomes Son in new ways. This is not from the point of view of his ontology, but from the point of view of God's offers of grace in history.

This seems to approach David Coffey's position that " in Jesus there was a progressive actualisation of the divine Sonship" [Coffey, 1984,477] This would enable Congar to hold, as he wishes to do, that Jesus human nature in the shape of his human freedom is constitutively involved in our redemption because by freely drawing closer to God in love, he precipitates the full realisation of his Sonship and this in conjunction with the Spirit. This may , however, go further than Congar would wish as it could suggest an ontological change after the Incarnation.

If the baptism is the first decisive event in which the Spirit acted to make Jesus Son for us in a new way, the second such event is Jesus' resurrection and glorification. We are now moving into the second stage of the involvement of the Spirit in Christology. The first stage dealt with the Spirit in the birth and life of Jesus. We now move to the stage of the Spirit associated with the Risen Lord. Here we are concerned with the re-ascent of Jesus to the Father, and also with the possibility of our subsequent ascent with him and through him. In his earthly life Jesus was son of God in weakness and kenosis and gradually, in the Spirit, grew in consciousness of his sonship. At his Resurrection again through the Spirit, he is constituted son of God in a new way, in power.

Congar looks at the texts which taken together, give us a two- stage Christology , a historical Christology of exaltation. This probably developed early because it can be found in a text which expresses a borrowing from an earlier tradition - R.1,3f. It is also expressed in such texts as Acts,2,32-35, 1 Cor.15,42-45, and Heb. 1,5-6. There are said to be two stages in the Christ event - the state of descent, of kenosis, and that of glorification; the realm of the sarx, the flesh, and that of the pneuma, the spirit. The Son of God passes through these two stages. In the second of the two stages God raised Jesus from the dead to establish him in power. 'This was done according to the Spirit. He was ' put to death in the flesh but made alive in the Spirit.' (1 Pet.3,18) Jesus is raised from the dead to be

present as both victim and Risen Lord. So, Congar argues

> It is the Spirit, as the content and the end of the Promise and therefore as an eschatological gift, who establishes 'Jesus', that is Christ in his crucified humanity, in his condition as the 'Son of God in power' and as Kyrios. The Spirit permeates him and makes him a Pneuma zoopoioun, a spiritual being giving life. [Congar 1983, I, 38,39.]

Having sunk to the depths he was raised to become life-giving spirit, who can then impart the Spirit. For Paul this two-stage christology clearly has a soteriological meaning - the great exchange, 2 Cor.8-9. This Christology probably started as an elevation Christology, but later, perhaps to avoid a perceived adoptionist interpretation, the Spirit was shown as being at work right from the moment of Jesus conception -in the infancy stories of Matthew and Luke. The first epistle of Peter also shows the connection of the two-stage Christology with the Christology of exchange. Congar sums up:

> Two aspects and similarly two conditions in Christ's quality of Son can be distinguished in a **historical** Christology. He was the Son of God in forma servi, that is, in the flesh. As such he received the Spirit, was made holy by him and acted through him, especially in the struggle against the demon. Following his resurrection, he was constituted according to the Holy Spirit as the Son of God with power. He was seated at the right hand of God and was assimilated to Him even in his humanity. From that moment onwards, then, and from heaven, he gives the Spirit. [Congar 1986,91]

As the Risen Lord Jesus becomes the Prototokos, the first-born to divine life. He is the first-born of the multitude of which we form a part. The role of the Spirit is important here and is connected with what the Spirit is. It is the function of the Spirit to be, as von Balthasar says, the 'beyond ' of history. He opens up history. By that is meant that he removes the limitations of history - seen in his association with prophecy. As a historical person Jesus was subject to these limitations in that he suffered death. This, however , was not final. God, in the power of His Spirit as liberator. raised Jesus. In breaking the power of death, of history, the Lordship of Jesus was established. Once Lord, Jesus can give the

Spirit. It is by this giving that we are incorporated into the 'many brethren,' that for us also death is not ultimately triumphant, and it is because of what the Spirit is in himself that he can perform this function. The Spirit is the one who brings the 'last days' into history, incorporates us in them. He removes for us the limitations of history; i.e. we transcend death to live thereafter. It is also because the Spirit is involved with the bringing about of the sonship of Jesus that this unitive function is not simply that of a deus ex machina but is grounded in the missions of the Word and the Spirit as they do the will of the Father.

It is not the case, then, that the Spirit Christology of function, which sees Jesus from the point of view of what he was intended to be for us - Saviour in the form of a servant, and then Risen Lord - supplants the ontological Christology of the Councils. It supplements it. It could be said that function pre- supposes being. Just as there is this necessity to hold together ontology and function, so there is the need to retain an 'objective' sense of redemption, in the sense of taking seriously that we have been redeemed through the blood of Christ -Eph.1,7 - while acknowledging that modern thinking makes it necessary to interpret how these historical objective facts can be meaningfully integrated into present day human existence.

There are strengths in the Spirit approach to Christology. It is biblical. It is eschatological. An emphasis on the Spirit as constitutive of Christ emphasises, better that Logos Christology can, the eschatological and universal significance of Christ. It is also soteriological. It does not separate God in Himself, from God for us. It does full justice to sacred history, which Scholastic theology, concentrating too much on the ontology of Christ, failed to do, and it allows also for the full humanity of Christ.

The involvement of the Spirit in Christology also, as has been said above, has dangers, especially that of Adoptionism. It is necessary, if this is to be avoided, to preserve in one's Christology, the ontological, Trinitarian and pre-existent character of Jesus. The gospel of Luke does this by portraying Jesus as conceived by the Holy Spirit, bringing in an ontological concern to the earlier tradition which perceived Jesus' Sonship in functional terms - R.1,4, the baptism pericopes.

3.a.Jesus Christ - Son of God.

Congar is aware of this danger of Adoptionism. He stresses, therefore, that Jesus

was ontologically the Son of God because of the hypostatic union from the moment of his conception.[Congar 1983,III,171: 1986,92.] The Spirit is involved in the conception of Jesus not in the sense of filling a human conceptus with a unique spiritual dimension, adoptionist, but as making the humanity of Jesus, the God-Man, holy, the temple of the Holy Spirit. In addition, as we have seen, Father Congar also seems to give a role to the Holy Spirit in the very creation of the humanity with which the Word unites himself hypostatically. He says also that (in the economy) " the Word proceeds a Patre Spirituque, from the Father and the Spirit, since the latter intervenes in all the acts or moments in the history of the Word **incarnate.**" [Congar 1986,93.] Father Congar's main intention, in addition to avoiding Adoptionism in these ways, is to assert the union of the actions of Word and Spirit as they carry out the intention of the Father. He would follow St. Thomas in granting a logical priority to the assumption of a human nature by the Word, believing as he does that we should " respect the two missions, of the Word and of the Spirit, on the pattern of the succession which derives from the procession within the Trinity." [Congar 1983,I25.] This indicates that Congar is working with a procession model of the Trinity which does not help to explain a coming of the Spirit from the Father to the humanity of Jesus with the result that it becomes the resting place of the Word.

To return to Adoptionism, there is no question either, of Jesus' being a special man who was for the first time adopted as Son of God at his baptism. However, because, he wants to give weight to the history of salvation, he suggests that" there were two moments when the virtus or effectiveness of the Spirit in Jesus was actuated in a new way....at his baptism...at the time of his resurrection and exaltation." [Congar 1983,II,171.]

The Son becomes Son in new ways, not ontologically, but in what he is for us. Congar believes that since the in-itself cannot be separated from the for-us, the declaration of Christ's Messiahship at his baptism, his 'anointing' for this, can only be because he is already the " Saviour who is Christ the Lord."(L.2,11) The Word-Son becomes Messiah-Son and later, by another intervention of the Spirit, Saviour-Son. "God has made him both Lord and Christ."(Acts,2,36)

In the first acting of the Spirit, Father Congar understands the baptism to have brought about a change, not only in how Jesus appeared to others, but also in how he understood himself as Son and his mission as being that of Servant. [Congar 1986,88.] There is ample scriptural evidence showing Jesus acting in the power of the Spirit, to preach the Kingdom of God and to show that in him it had already

come - (L.4,14,18-19, L10,9-11Mk.1,15, Mt.12,28.)

In relation to the second intervention of the Spirit, in the resurrection and exaltation of Jesus, Congar uses his understanding of the Spirit in Christology to link our sonship with that of Jesus and in so doing returns to the Trinitarian aspect of Christology. The purpose of the Christ event is the salvation of humanity, the return of all to the Father, and this involves the Resurrection and glorification, the second 'moment' when the power of the Spirit acts in Jesus. The one who in his earthly life had received the Spirit is constituted Son of God with power according to that Spirit. Seated at the right hand of the Father he can now give the Spirit so that we might re-ascend with him. It is largely because he wants to give due weight to this aspect of re-ascent - the aspect with which the Holy Spirit is involved - that Father Congar has moved towards a pneumatological Christology. [Congar 1986,86.] Whereas Logos Christology concentrates on the descent of the Only-Begotten Son, Spirit Christology with a focal point in the Resurrection, reminds us that Jesus is also the Protokos, the first-born to divine life who will bring about our resurrection also.

> Like him in his humanity , we too shall only be fully sons through the glorious transfiguration of the resurrection, but again like him, we are already sons according to the first-fruits of this life, 'amid sighings'. For us , as for Jesus himself, the quality of sonship is, in both its stages, the work of the Spirit. The Spirit is not only the third in the intra-divine life, although he is equal in consubstantiality, - he is also , in the economy of salvation, the agent of sonship as the effect of the grace and reality of holy living. The whole of our filial life is animated by the Spirit." [Congar 1983,III,170-171.]

From what he says in his 'Theological meditation on the Third person' it is submitted that Congar is to be understood as meaning that if we are to escape from the notion of 'merits' of Christ being in some way grasped as objects by the individual, we have to think in terms of the open-ness of an inter-personal relationship between Christ and the individual, mirroring the intra- Trinitarian situation. [Congar 1983,III,144 -151.] The Spirit as the third Person of the Trinity opens up the relationship of Father and Son. Without the Spirit it would be a closed reciprocal relationship. With the Spirit love goes beyond that. It takes on the character of outwardness, of fruitfulness, of seeking some good beyond itself.

The person of the Spirit explains the yearning nature of the love of God which the history of salvation reveals to us. So if the Spirit is involved in the constitution of the incarnate Son he makes that Son subject and so open to the possibility of relationship with others, i.e. with us when the same Spirit carries out the identical function in us. That is to say that the Spirit has to be involved in the ontology of the incarnate Word, in the creation of his very being, - this would be at his conception - so that there can be Christ for us, the Christ who through the Spirit will make us sons with him.

In I Believe in the Holy Spirit [III, 170] Congar understands the involvement of the Holy Spirit not with the ontology of the Incarnate Word but with Jesus sonship perceived from the point of view of God's gracious plan for our salvation and he sites the first being son-for-us at the annunciation, with later constitutive moments at the baptism and the resurrection and glorification of Jesus. However, in The Word and the Spirit, in considering the relationship between the economic and the eternal sonship, he says that he believes that the Word was conceived "incarnandum and even crucificendum, glorificandum, caput multorum Dei filiorum," that, at his conception he had to be made flesh, crucified and glorified as the head of many sons of God. [Congar 1986,93] The reference to the Word being conceived 'incarnandum' and ' crucificendum' cannot be imputing a necessity to the God of freedom. It is suggested it means that somehow the incarnate Word existed in God as more than one of a number of possibilities. Something existed other than the freedom of infinite possibility, actuated as it were, to put right something once it had gone wrong. The infinite possibility which must be an attribute of the absolute God of Christianity would account for the possibility of salvation by way of incarnation, but what would be the basis in God of the decision to act in this way? Assuming that God does not act in a purely arbitrary manner there must be something in His being which accounts for His decision. We can see the way Congar thinks when we read in 'Dum Visibiliter Deum Cognoscimus'

> No Absolute exists which is not also love, no mighty God who is not the loving God, God turned towards us, God for us. There is no 'I am', no **Ens a se**, no Aseity, that does not contain within itself, not only the possibility, but also the positive desire to be 'I will be (for your sake, moving towards you, acting with you).' There is no 'He is, He was' who is not simultaneously 'He comes.'[Congar 1968b,89]

The essence of God is not only infinite freedom but also infinite love, and since love is of its nature out-going it terminates first in creation and then in salvation.The Spirit in the Trinity can be understood as love personified and is thus properly associated with creation and with salvation. Redemption and the means to it are always there in God. It is suggested that it is possible to understand the incarnational method of salvation chosen by God not as either necessary or simply a reflection of His nature, but as interaction with a creation which, because it involved freedom involved suffering , and could only be redeemed from tragedy by the participation of God Himself in that suffering.)

3.b.'Economic' and Eternal Sonship. Pre-existence.

If the economic Trinity and the immanent Trinity were to be equated it would follow from what Congar has said above that the Spirit would be involved in the eternal begetting of the Word - it is because of this contradicting of the Filioque that Barth rejects the absolute equation of the economic with the immanent Trinity. Congar as has already been indicated does not believe that the reciprocity of Rahner's 'fundamental axiom ' can be accepted without reservation. [Congar 1983,III,11-18] Though the interpretation of who Jesus is and what he does in terms of the Spirit is primarily concerned with the economy, Scripture does speak of Jesus Christ as already existing in God independently of his temporal incarnation; Phil.2,5f., Jn 8,38; 8,58; & 17,24, for example. Congar also refers to Jesus' reply to the High Priest in the Synoptic Gospels and to the theme of Christ as the image of God in Col.1,15-20 and Heb.1,2-3. Indeed, he says," It is not enough simply to make a distinction between the eternal Word and the man-God of the Incarnation. Scripture speaks of the pre-existence of the latter." [Congar 1986,94]

He goes on to cite Karl Barth as a theologian who vigorously rejects any consideration of the Word other than Jesus Christ. Jesus Christ is God and the Son of God is Jesus Christ. God wanted to be Jesus Christ , and Jesus Christ is not only the one chosen but the God who chooses. This raises the obvious difficulty, how can God be Jesus Christ ? Congar says that a Thomist is bound to object to Barth's formulation. Aquinas's answer to the question " Is it true that a man is God?" is that it is, because of the hypostatic union. It is however a qualified "Yes"

> He adds that this is not exact **reduplicative,** if man is taken as such. Thomas always speaks **formaliter.** The claim to attribute hypostasis to the Word is one thing and that of nature another. Nature was only assumed and united in time.[Congar 1986,95]

This does not mean, for Thomas that we can speak of an existence of the Word **before** human nature was assumed by the Word.

> 'Before' is not meaningful in the context of the present and eternity of God. The eternal begetting of the Word, the Son , has, as its end, the Word, the Son assuming the humanity of Jesus, which, in our own time or history was brought about in the Annunciation.....we may therefore conclude that it is possible to speak of the Word **without** Jesus' assumption of humanity, although it is not possible to speak of that Word **before** the incarnation." [Congar 1986,95.]

In the eternal present, therefore, Jesus is begotten incarnandum and the Father is eternally the Father of Our Lord Jesus Christ. In this way Congar believes that justice is done to the fact that God in Himself, God as He is, is not the same as God revealed in the economy, and also to the scriptural assertions of pre-existence. The immanent Trinity can only be known through the economy. The latter must reveal the former. If the Incarnation of Jesus Christ signalled a completely new beginning, if Jesus did not somehow exist within God from eternity, would this be so?
Congar states his own position only by quoting and affirming the words of Louis Bouyer;

> it is in time that God makes Himself man, i.e. it is in a definite moment of time that our humanity is assumed. But as far as He is concerned, He assumes it eternally. Then the Father eternally generates the Son, not only as before His incarnation, but as the Word made flesh. [Congar 1986,97.]

Conclusion.

Congar has said elsewhere that the passion of his life is the church. [Congar

1969,7.] He links, calling them his three loves, the Church, the laity and the priesthood. This is, I think, the first pointer to understanding his Christology. He is driven by the vision of the bringing of the human race to God and the ways in which this is accomplished. So though an ardent admirer of St. Thomas and his approach to Christology, Father Congar is not a philosopher and is not primarily interested in explaining Christ in philosophical terms. Early in his career he was involved in writing a conclusion to the series in "La Vie Intellectuelle" on the contemporary causes of unbelief and this led him to see the need to present God as a living God involved in and relevant to humanity.[Congar 1935] His real Christological interest, it is submitted, lies in how man comes to God through Christ, rather than in concentration on the inner being of the mediator. The mediation of Jesus Christ is the culmination of God's eternal design. It is to be expected firstly, therefore, that his Christology will be soteriological. The functional aspect is highlighted and so he is drawn to the involvement of the Holy Spirit, scripturally revealed as eschatological gift, in Christology. This is within an understanding that who the Spirit is governs what the Spirit does, just as in Christ being and function are connected. All that Scripture says in metaphor about the Spirit indicates something of what that Spirit is. So as God is a rock, that is, stability and strength for us, as Christ is the lamb, the victim, so the Spirit is breath, the principle of life, living water, the bearer of life. The Spirit is wind, the unconfined. It is of his nature to transcend barriers. The Spirit is the finger of God, His instrument , His power. The Spirit is the Spirit of holiness. The Spirit is the one who ushers in the last days. His is the presence which shows that the time has come for God to be all in all. All that we know of the Spirit, therefore, makes it possible for us to speak of him as being, in a special way, involved with the interaction of God with history, of God with men and women. The Spirit is the "go-between" God who links the historical world with the transcendent. It is something particular to the Spirit which enables us to say this, just as it was something particular to the Second Person of the Trinity which entailed that he should be the incarnate One. It is the Spirit who is involved in the relationship of Jesus with the Father. It is the Spirit who is involved in our relationship with the Father because through the Spirit Jesus was raised from the dead and through the Spirit the way was opened for us also to enter the relationship of sonship.

The Spirit who makes the humanity of Christ a humanity of the Son of God makes us sons also by grace. This will have repercussions in his ecclesiology, his sacramental theology and in his approach to the personal spiritual life of the

Christian.

Secondly the coming of mankind to God takes place in human history. All that we know of God is mediated by history. The final revelation, the coming of God to man in the person of Jesus Christ took place within history. Congar is interested in stressing that the humanity of Christ is given its due weight and believes that a historical Christology can do this because it makes it possible to show that the humanity of Christ, though united to the Person of the Word, was like ours. The involvement of the Spirit helps us understand how this is so. Christ was Son of God, but in forma servi. Like us he received the Spirit, was made holy by the Spirit, called on the Spirit so that he might be totally conformed to the will of God. In his life, a life lived in the Spirit, Jesus human will led him to his obedient and salvific death on the cross. This life of Jesus was a life of total unity through the Spirit with the Father, but Congar, it is submitted ought to have done more to show that the human life and death of Jesus can be interpreted as being the sign of the Kingdom in practice so that the Resurrection is the logical outcome thereof. He has gone some way towards this in calling attention to the historicity of salvation and indicating that the Spirit-filled life, and the death offered in the Spirit, are acts of the Son who is Servant, but it is submitted that more emphasis on the life of Jesus and especially on the cross, is necessary. It must be said however that he has moved Christology away from dualism by bringing in the Spirit as the unifying factor, the one acting in all moments of the Jesus who is the Christ.

CHAPTER FIVE
THE CHRISTIAN LIFE.

1.Theological Anthropology

2.Life in the Spirit.

CHAPTER FIVE
THE CHRISTIAN LIFE

1. Theological Anthropology

1a. Congar's understanding of the Human Person.

Theological anthropology has to do with the destiny of the human person. Christian Scripture and tradition tell of God's intention in creation, its vitiation in the Fall, its redemption in Christ. Throughout the centuries there have been many attempts at interpreting the nature of the being whom God created 'in His image', at explaining how he is to blame for the fact that his present existence is not that envisaged by the Creator and at interpreting how the action of God in Christ did and does bring about the possibility that the experiment of creation does not end in futility. The ultimate aim of this section of the thesis will be to consider what Congar's approach adds to our understanding.

Congar's understanding of anthropology is not set out systematically in one particular place and has to be deduced from what he says in his many works. He begins from the understanding of God as the One who is alone the supremely holy, the totally self-sufficient, entirely happy in the perfect communion of love in which He is Father, Son and Spirit.[Congar1962b, 238.] God is in no way bound to create. He does not, however, limit His love to Himself but "in his love calls into existence beings other than himself, who 'are' only by virtue of the relation through which their existence is grounded in him. These beings are the visible and invisible things which, in their totality, constitute the world of which we are a part." [ibid.] God, then, is present in His creation first of all by His creative power. He is in it in order that it may exist. Since, Congar says, God's causality is God Himself, the world which He has created and transcends, is filled with His Divine Presence and power. [ibid p.239.] There are, however, further ways in which God is present with His creatures. God is with them by grace. It is in this sphere that the human being has its special place. "Man is naturally the measure of the world for he is its supreme outcome; he is also its epitome." [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985, 117.] It is to men and women that the possibility of possessing God " as the content of the knowledge and the love in which the life of a spiritual being is really lived " is given.[Congar 1962b, 239.] Grace turns the human being towards God, so much so that we can actually " touch and possess him....his own living Substance." [ibid] Congar therefore, understands the human

being as one with whom God is not simply by His creative power and causality, "but according to his substance, and, if we may venture to say so, personally. The Fathers and the theologians make it perfectly clear by referring to Holy Scripture that it is no longer a Presence which is involved, but an Indwelling." [Congar 1962b, 240.] It is this gratuity to the human being which makes that being the ' epitome' of creation and grounds the possibility of a divinization which will only be perfectly accomplished in heaven. [ibid. p.239.]

1a.1 Man, Image of God.

Biblical anthropology expressed the conviction of man's supreme importance to which Congar refers, in the terms that man was made in the image of God. Theology through the centuries has sought to spell out what is meant by this. All the things which are said when speaking of the Christian experience - that God reveals Himself, that He has spoken to His people, that He wills their eternal salvation, and so on - assume an understanding of what the human being, who is the subject concerned with the saving message of Revelation, is.

> In the Bible the affirmations about God are linked to the affirmations about man. Why should this be so ? Because the content of Revelation is not God as He is in Himself, exactly. God revealed Himself in the temporal revelation of the Incarnation and established a unique relation between himself and man.[Granfield 1967,249.]

The human being, therefore, must be regarded as someone capable of entering into a relationship with God. This possibility exists according to Congar because God is a personal being as is man made in His image.[Congar 1985a, 43] This situates the essence of the human being, that which makes him or her 'the measure of the world', in personhood.

One way of looking at the idea of person is to see it as essentially linked with being regarded as an absolute category. This is what Maritain, explaining the fundamental tenets of Thomism, calls the intuition of being which is a primary fact. Being, he says, "is the first of all concepts, because it springs to the mind at the first awakening of thought, at the first intelligible coming to grips with the experience of sense by transcending sense." [Maritain1957, 34] It follows that we think first of the concept of being and then move to the way in which that being manifests itself. One of the ways in which being manifests itself is as persons, so,

on this view, what gives man or woman his or her ontology, what is the basis for his or her existence, is not his or her personhood, which is secondary, but his or her nature, his or her essential quality. As Congar sees it, ancient anthropology situated man at the top of a hierarchy of beings, and though St. Thomas (Summa Contra Gentiles, IV,11) was conscious that man was unique in being a knowing subject, that he is " the highest form of being", (that is of the 'id quod est', what really exists,) there is a danger in Thomism, though Congar does not think that St. Thomas himself succumbed to it, of conceiving the human being in the way of natural things, of there being no real setting apart of the domain of the person as distinct from all other forms of being. There is, however, he says, another way of looking at what it is that gives the human being his or her identity. He says that he likes to follow the intuitions of someone like Vladimir Lossky, who deriving his reflections from the Fathers of the Church distinguish between nature and person. "There is an ontology of the person which cannot be reduced to a pure ontology of nature. The ontology of the person is much more relational and historical."[Lauret 1988,71-72] Congar ascribes this intuition to the Cappadocian Fathers.[ibid.p.72.] This understanding of personhood goes back to the Patristic searching for a grasp of how it is that God exists.

As the result of this development of the Cappadocian Fathers John Zizioulas states that the ground of being in God can be expressed by the term 'hypostasis' used to mean 'person', but this term has been given ontological weight by its association with its former meaning of 'ousia', and so the ontology of God, the ground of His being, rests not in ousia or substance, but in the person of the Father. [Zizioulas,1985,88] This results in a more biblical doctrine of God for in the New Testament God means Father, but also avoids any hint of subordinationism. Congar agrees that it is wrong to think first of a divine essence within which one then distinguishes three persons, and goes on "I would not go so far as to say God is God because He is Father, but He is certainly God by being Father, and not according to something anterior to this quality." [Lauret, 1988,60.] He thus dismisses the idea put forward by some Eastern theologians, that the West thinks of God primarily as impersonal substance.

It is submitted that this is not just of academic importance. It is existentially important also. By basing the ground of being of God in His personhood rather than on an impersonal substance or nature, necessity is abolished and the God who is Father, freely bringing forth Son and Spirit, affirms His existence in this relational, this loving act. This is why we can say that God is love. It is in the image of this personal God, this relational God who is love, that the human being

was created, to fulfil him or herself in a communion with other human beings. Father Congar notes that this notion, that man bears the image of God in that he is made to realise his potentiality in communion with others sharing the same nature, is a modern one, not one taken up by the Fathers, who while speaking of the image of God in terms of Gen.1,26-27, were more or less influenced by platonic ideas and found the image of God in the higher or spiritual part of the human being. [Congar 1974, 687-703] He goes on to say, in his article on the Tri-unity of God, that one can throw light on the human condition in the light of what God is, a community of Persons, if it is remembered that one is only speaking analogically and that the three Divine Persons are **consubstantial**. That done, it is a legitimate, and possibly fruitful, interpretation (of the Cappadocian understanding of the Godhead) to see in a communion of human persons a reflection of Trinitarian life.[Congar 1974, 688] In the Trinity the Persons share a common nature because they communicate to one another everything except what distinguishes one from another. They "se compénètrent et s'enveloppent mutuellement", they are perfectly present to one another.[Congar 1974,689] It is this union in Trinitarian life which is reflected in the human being seen as one of many. Each individual has within himself the capacity to be open to others, only fulfils him or herself in communion with others, and is made so as to live in relationship with others in the exercise of a 'co-humanity'. " It is legitimate, indeed necessary, to see in that a reflection of the Tri-unity of God." [Congar 1974, 698.]

There is a specifically Eastern anthropology, mentioned above, grounded in the notion that the human being is made up of a material part and of one which is connected with the divine, the nous or the pneuma. In Plato especially the nous is drawn to contemplation (of the Ideas which make up the world of the divine) and the one who lives under its rule lives in a true spiritual fashion when he turns away from base matters and by purification becomes more and more God-like, is divinised. The Christian view of man in this tradition is to be found in the belief that he (we, unlike some of the Fathers, would also say she) is **essentially** in the image of God, God not only gave man a body and a soul but breathed into the human being His spirit, something of the divine being. He belongs therefore to God's race made to realise this likeness fully and to enjoy divine immortality by a process of deification which takes place as prayer and contemplation, (asceticism also in some strands of the tradition) bring about a progressive spiritualization and finally transformation. [Congar 1964, 258 ff.]

This theological anthropology, which understands a participation in God as

somehow 'essential' or 'natural', proceeding from creation in the image of God, might be thought to run the risk of thinking in terms of a salvation independent of the historical Incarnation of the Word. In both traditions, however, East and West, Christ is Saviour: incarnate, crucified, when resurrected and glorified he becomes Lord. In the East his work is understood as the restoration of man's nature which already bears the stamp of God. In the West it is reconciliation, understood in the moral rather than the ontological order.[Congar 1964, 268-9] To move from this idea of restoration to consider the process as somehow mystically detached from Christ's earthly life would only be possible if one were to ignore the personal dimension of both God and man. John Meyendorff says that the human freedom of each individual person is seen as the real expression of the image of God in the Greek Patristic tradition, in Basil, Gregory of Nyssa and Cyril of Alexandria, for example. This human freedom points to the divine freedom of the Creator. [Meyendorff 1989, 491.] As he understands the position, the Persons in The Trinity are totally open to one another, and in the Incarnation, the hypostasis of the Son opened itself to humanity thereby extending the mutuality of personal relationships, which is love, beyond its existence in the being of God, to the temporal being of those whom He willed into existence and who are, because they are in His image, hypostatically open to Him.

> Thus the hypostatic dimension of divine Trinitarian life, as well as its image in humanity, excludes the idea that redemption, salvation and deification are automatic or magical processes of absorption of the human by the divine. [Meyendorff 1989, 492.]

Another danger of stressing that men are substantially image of God , that the desire for God is built into human nature, is that it might be thought to compromise the gratuity of grace. The position of the Greek Fathers was essentially soteriological. It had to be maintained that salvation came from God alone for man had fallen - the terms used are different from those used in the West, illumination, deification rather than justification, but the reality is the same.- so grace is necessary. There is however the assumption that this necessary grace must be compatible with human freedom. Most of the Fathers understood God as co-operating with a self-determining human being. Grace does not make human effort unnecessary, it co-operates with it. Stephen Duffy says that though there were differences in approach, thinkers as different as Tertullian and

Ambrose found a meeting point in the doctrine of grace and freedom.

> God had given all the inalienable capacity to choose good and spurn evil. Only personal choices can enhance or restrict our inalienable capacity for self-determination. Whatever the consequences of Adam's fall the Scriptures clearly indicate through God's commands the capacity of human nature to opt for the good. God does not command the impossible....this common viewpoint narrowed the role of grace to clarifying good and evil, to facilitating what can be done by human powers, and to forgiving the repentant.[Duffy 1993,71-72]

The systematic Western theology of grace may be said to have begun with Augustine, hammered out in his controversies with Manichaeanism and Pelagianism. The essence of the position arrived at was that without grace human nature is powerless, has no capacity for good, which can only be recognised by the light of divine wisdom. Good acts are therefore possible only by the love and grace of God.

Augustine's anthropology moved away from the 'merit' ascetic anthropology in that it understood grace to be unconnected with an individual's prior achievements. In other words, grace which is the source of good deeds is itself unearned grace. The idea of human autonomy moves into the background.

Aquinas in his theology accepts many of Augustine's insights. Like him he interprets Genesis literally and maintains that the disorder of man's nature, concupiscence, is the result of original sin, transmitted to the whole race by generation. In Adam human nature was corrupted and in his race corruption moves from nature to persons. Aquinas however, is less pessimistic than Augustine and moves from the notion of grace healing a radically defective human nature to that of grace as 'super' natural in the sense of healing and elevating us because it corresponds to the aspiration of our nature, as yet broken and off-key in its orientation. It was the understanding of Aquinas that man reaches towards the vision of God. The difficulty that this might compromise the gratuity of God is avoided if one thinks in terms of a double initiative. God brings man into being in order to call him. [de Lubac 1967, 106] This would approximate to Congar's position .[Congar 1983, II, 67]

The human being can be called good as created by the good God who is the image and goal of His creature; to be good, however, in the deeper sense of knowing the life of God, achieving eternal life, needs God's grace. (S.T.1 q.12 a13) but this grace is responding to something authentically human. Therefore

"God in giving us participation in the divine inner life gives us to ourselves and releases within us the authoritative powers that make us who we are as humans."[Duffy, 1993, p.153.]

It is not to be thought that Congar, in looking at the Fathers, is suggesting the substitution of a Patristic anthropology to replace a neo-Thomist one, objectivist and insensitive to human subjectivity, which has come to seem unsatisfactory. His view of 'ressourcement' meant going back to the documents of Scripture and the Fathers as a source of inspiration but not in a mechanistic or 'archaeological' fashion.[Congar (1950) 1968,316] Indeed he does not develop an anthropology based on the image of God but says that he would like to see more reflection on the connection between man made in the image of God, and God in His essential mystery.[Congar 1967c,79] The Eastern approach is concerned with ontology rather than with activity. Human nature is conceived of as the image of God in the sense that participation in the divine is what brings it about. To say that man is made in the image of God is to say that this image, this form is a necessary, constitutive part of his being. It is not just a likeness to God which can be recognised in him after his being has been defined in other terms. This has definite repercussions. It means that human nature participates in what is essentially divine. There is no area of pure nature set apart from grace. That this is Congar's view is seen from the fact that in several places in his work he states that it is a misunderstanding of St. Thomas Aquinas to ascribe such a separation to him. Attributes such as spirituality, incorruptibility and immortality are not gifts added to a human nature which is complete in itself without them.

> They belong intrinsically to the perfect image which faithfully reproduces its model and which simply is human nature when it is really conformed to its model, its idea, its intrinsic truth. In short, divinization.....is not a gift super-added to a nature complete in itself; it is the very stuff of that nature when it is perfect and realises its own truth. [Congar 1964, 277.]

The West, however, " seeks to posit each individual thing in its own particular being and then to note its relationships; the relation for example between nature and grace, the relation between the Church and the state, the relation between members of the Church within the Church itself." [Congar 1964, 275] There was a development in the Latin Tradition which led to the separation of nature and grace rather than the distinction between them, whereby grace came to be regarded as something alien to human nature, imposed upon it from the outside,

there being no intrinsic connection between the two. This led to the dualisms which have plagued Catholic theology - Church and World, salvation history and secular history, sacred and secular. From such an approach, in Eastern eyes, follows an 'externality' in Western thought.

Congar does not discuss the relationship of nature and grace systematically or in depth, but it is clear that he is unhappy with the Western pre-occupation with the distinction between natural and supernatural, and feels that St. Thomas's understanding of grace as the raising up of our potential for life and as the perfection of nature, has been forgotten.[Congar 1964, 266.] This insight allied to reflection on the Eastern view of man essentially made in the image of God and freely called to co-operation with Him might be helpful for theology to-day. He sees that

> philosophical thought...is decidedly centred on consideration of the personal subject, irreducible to the order of **things**, and on man as capable of personal decision.[Congar 1967c, 69.]

As a result modern people look on the problem of existence in a different light. There is an extrinsicism foreign to the modern way of thinking in the language of nature and super-nature in that it fails to treat the human being as a graced subject, existentially situated in history which has its own meaning. There has been a radical change in modern times, in the way the human being understands himself or herself and the world, so it is not surprising that there must be changes is the way they see themselves in relation to God. Theology reflects on faith, but faith in a particular time and in a particular context. Congar mentions such modern currents of thought as the phenomenological method and the philosophy of existence as leading to a concentration on the human being, on the specificity of the human person and the existential approach to human questions. Developments such as these in philosophy, or those in the anthropological sciences or in the area of biblical criticism cannot be ignored.[Congar 1967c,17-18.] The same approach appears in Gaudium et Spes, n.62. " Theological research, while it deepens knowledge of revealed truth, should not lose contact with its own times."

Congar's view of humankind is an affirmative one and he does not follow those who would - in an attempt to protect the uniqueness and transcendence of grace - see a radical dichotomy between a human nature having no possibility of value in itself, and grace. Just as there was the one-sided pagan view that all the human

beings greatness comes from the self, so there was the opposite, equally one-sided view of some of the Fathers of the Church which found man's greatness only in terms of his relationship with God, in what God had done for him and in him. There was, however, in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries a re-discovery of nature and a more positive appreciation of it. In our own century the re-emergence of the insight that there is no pure nature separated from grace, linked with the recovery of the historical and existential perspective, allowed the development of the view that everyone is called to be with God, everyone is affected by grace, an understanding set out by Henri de Lubac and developed by Karl Rahner. This pattern of thought leads away from an individualist attitude to salvation and to the more Biblical understanding of the person who, in relation to salvation, is a person within a people, a community.

It is submitted that Father Congar is thinking along these lines when he quotes with approval the Thomist Scholars who have shown that, though there did develop a view among some of the interpreters of St. Thomas that the supernatural was in a sense alien to nature and to humanity, in the writings of Aquinas "there are affirmed an autonomy and a value of created things **in themselves** and most particularly of man."[Congar (1957 & 65) 1985, 412]

As has already been noted above, part of the essence of God is that He is Three. His nature is personalised in such a way that the wholeness of that nature is possessed by each of the three Persons. As a result they are completely present to one another. There is no opposition, no exclusion. Since human nature is perfectly in the image of

this God it would exhibit not isolation and separation but " that uni-plurality which humanity so deeply desires." [Congar 1964 277.]

This was written in the context of ecumenical dialogue. Congar's great hope was to foster union by means of greater understanding between the churches. However, if we look at it from a slightly different angle we have an indication that Father Congar's interest in and presentation of the Eastern approach to anthropology and salvation provides an additional insight in the attempt to convince the sympathetically seeking modern person that salvation is not something arbitrary , something extrinsic, but is concerned with the linking of the deepest Being of God with the being of man. Man's continual quest not to be alone, which at the deepest level is doomed to frustration in human terms, is connected with the nature of his being and can only be fulfilled by his re-finding the God in whose image he was created. We have in this approach a reminder that man is essentially personal because God , whose image is part of man's being, is

personal. Man is in essence not a solitary being, because God, in whose image he was created, is a Trinitarian God. This is in tune with the climate of modern thought with its emphasis on the personal and also on the importance placed on the relational in man's development and self-understanding. Both Eastern and Western churches enshrine the basic Christian value of the dignity of the human being. Whereas Eastern Christianity is concerned especially with the dignity of human nature, the West has taken up the idea of the dignity of the individual person. The latter has brought many advantages but there is the disadvantage that it may be stressed at the expense of communitarian values. Congar believes that the West, drawn by the attraction of the notion of autonomous individuality , has neglected the social element in personal fulfilment and the value of " communion and community ". [Congar 1964, 285 .] He is correct in this. As in other areas, such as politics, an idea, good and fruitful in itself, becomes harmful if pushed to extremes and made the sole criterion for judgement. We have seen, for example, the growth of a morality where the perceived good of the individual is paramount and as long as no direct harm is seen to be done, the indirect social consequences of the act are disregarded, or again, in the name of freedom of the individual it is argued that consent to any action, however abhorrent, should remove it from the sphere of legal punishment and the possibility of adverse social consequences is derided as unproveable. Whether it is true to say that Eastern Christianity is more corporate than that of the West is debatable, but there is an argument for the view that the importance of the social is something which might be re-learned from the East with its stress on the dignity of human nature, as a counter to a Western tendency to individualism. [Congar 1964, 285-6]

1b. Man, World and Church.

Modern times have brought a new understanding of the person as subject, the unitary nature of the universe and of the significance of time. The notion that there is unity in the universe means that the human being is one with it, though incomparably greater that all other forms of existence because of his or her personal dimension. He or she transforms it. Thus " In man and through man the universe reaches a hypostatic or personal dignity.... In man and through man the cosmos accomplishes its purpose.[Congar 1969, 44.]

The notion, of the significance of time, leads to a different understanding of the human place in a cosmos which is itself seen as possessing a certain dynamism. [Congar 1967c, 60-62.] As a result man sees himself historically situated in a world with which he feels a certain solidarity, a world which he can help construct, a world in which he sees the possibility of working out his destiny, not alone before God, but in company with his others. It is a world also whose history strives first of all to restore integrity to the human being, to allow him or her to reach out beyond limitations to the end desired, in the last analysis this means to conquer death. Secondly it attempts to overcome separations and divisions, all the things which cut men and women off from their fellows. The world and humanity are perceived to have their own meaning and value. Theology must accept that instead of setting themselves in a stable, hierarchical cosmos, human beings now see themselves situated in a world seen as the stage for their actings, see themselves as looking forwards rather than to the past. " The point d'appui is no longer, as formerly, found by looking backwards to a 'given' order, but by looking forward to man's own dynamic plan" [Congar 1967c,70] In such a climate it would seem that the appropriate theological response would be in pneumatological form, the Spirit being the 'dynamic' in God.

To note the existence of the modern interest in subjectivity and in human progress is not to say that the present situation merits total approval. The concentration on the person has led to a humanism set over against Christianity, a philosophy based on existence and associated with the autonomy of men and women in which the notion of 'person' is detached from its theological roots, and this, allied with philosophies of progress suggest that it is indeed possible to move humanity, by humanity's efforts, from inauthentic to authentic existence. Congar notes that even for the Christian there are drawbacks in the dynamic approach because of the resulting negative tendency to reject the past and all that can be learned from

it, and to turn away from all exterior traditional authority. [Congar 1967c, 70]
One interpretation of the change of orientation could seem to make God redundant by making man god-like in controlling his existence. From such a viewpoint there is perceived to be no need for Some-one beyond us imposing obligations on us. It is against the resulting relativism and subjectivism in moral theory that Pope John Paul II has directed his letter Veritatis Splendor. It is fear of such an outcome which drives the conservative to try to resist change, to batten down the hatches and go on as before. Surely this stems from an inadequate vision of God. If one conceives God as a kind of super-parent managing a controlled environment then the child finding out its own powers poses a threat to the necessity of the controller. There must be found some way of convincing the modern subject that belief in the existence of a God who is and who reveals all truth, does not mean the abandonment of all rational thought and all freedom of decision and development. This would entail a development of the connection between the human being and God as He is in Himself.
Congar believes modern atheism is less an elimination of God than a turning away from what He has historically represented and would represent for men.[Congar 1967c, p.71.] This is in keeping with his optimistic ecumenical approach that understanding (of one and other's tradition) leads to progress.
There is another danger inherent in a new approach which incorporates the truth of the validity and importance of the reality of this world and of the human person: it is obvious that focusing on this aspect endangers the transcendent element. Congar picks this up and says that it is as wrong to take up an attitude in which the supernatural initiative is forgotten as it is to adopt one which so focuses on the vertical transcendent dimension that the horizontal is forgotten and one ends up with a kind of mystical idealism. [Congar 1967c,63-68] He calls this former tendency horizontalism and discerns it in preaching, the attitudes of the clergy as they seek to be as little different as possible from the people, in the Catholic press and in the liturgy. [Congar 1967c,64.]
Congar's attitude is to be understood in the context that in Congar's thought the relationship World/ Kingdom lies somewhere between the dualist position of Barth or Bouyer who would understand a total discontinuity between them, and the approach of Teilard de Chardin or Gustav Thils who understand a continuity between the present reality and the future Kingdom. While rejecting the pessimism of the former Congar feels that the latter group bring human history and the pneumatological order of the Kingdom too close together.[Congar (1957 &65) 1985, 84ff.] Just as there is danger in the total separation there is danger

also in the fusion of the two orders, the this-worldly and the other- worldly. Such danger, however, only surfaces if a part of the truth is allowed to become the whole. As in all things what is necessary is balance and the capacity to hold to the centrality of the core truth, that all worldly reality derives its validity from positive divine initiatives. [Congar 1967c, 66] What unity he does perceive comes from the unitary plan of God for "there is unity through final object , at least partial unity of subject and material cause, and unity of agent, namely the Word of God and the Holy Spirit."[Congar (1957 & 65) 1985, 88.]

World and humanity, therefore, both benefit from the redemptive intervention of God who through Christ restores creation and brings all to what it was intended to be from the beginning. This notion of restoration is important because it shows why Congar thinks the dualist view is wrong. Salvation comes about through this world restored, not by the creation of some new, totally divine, means. Using the metaphor which Congar does, this earthly vessel is re-floated rather than a new one being launched. The re-generating power is at work already in the world which cannot attain its end by its own efforts.[Congar (1957 & 65) 1985, 92.] As in the case of the human person, so in the case of the world, God will re-make all by His grace. The world will not achieve salvation by its own historical progress but by a gift from above and God's regenerative power is already present but working in a hidden and fragmented way.[Congar (1957 & 65) 1985, 85,92]

Although the present order is not totally separated from the eschatological order and the world will be saved, Church and World are not identical. They have a unity of plan and of ultimate end, but not of structure. In the order of grace, in the Church, Christ reigns and exercises his Lordship through the offices of prophet, priest and king, and this belongs to the structure of the Church. In the world order however, though Christ's Kingdom will come and he will be 'Lord of all creation', at the moment this Lordship is kenotic, exercised 'in forma servi'. Indeed the world is the place where Christ is rejected or ignored. [Congar 1966, 183] . This is a pejorative use of the term' world', for surely the world in the sense of human history, is God's world and God's history when without any specific religious reference, good and fulfilling things happen? Congar with his belief in the eschatological transformation of <u>this</u> world makes some allowance for such an understanding but one does not receive a sense of a positive embracing of the good outwith the Church. This may have some connection with the fact that he is largely uninterested in the cosmic dimension of salvation.

Congar separates the two areas Church and world; each is understood as working along its own lines. It is through individual Christians that the connection

between the world and the Kingdom takes place

His belief is that if what is necessary is a balanced approach which will give due weight to both the transcendent aspect yet incorporate the benefits to be obtained from worldly developments and values, work has to be done at two levels, that of the revealed datum and that of the 'construct' or theological reflection.[Congar 1967c,71ff] When dealing with the former one must take account not only of developments in the study of biblical languages and historical background, but also of new philosophical questions which affect the historicity of the given, which consider, for example, the relationship between objectivity and the believing subject, the nature of witness, the links between facts and what they signify, while at the same time maintaining the traditional attitude of critical questioning towards the world. The world's received ideas have to be questioned in the light of absolute values historically transmitted.

At the level of the theological construct it is necessary to relate the mysteries of the faith to the human existential situation without reducing the former to the latter. Revelation is **about** man's existential situation.[Congar1966c]

Congar quotes with approval A. J. Heschel's view that " The Bible is primarily not man's vision of God but God's vision of man." [Congar 1967c, 74; Herschel 1951.] In fact he sees it as both and believes that a union of the study of Revelation with what we know and experience as human beings can improve our understanding of God.

The importance of the anthropological viewpoint enters also at the level of fundamental theology. The older authoritarian, hierarchical ecclesiology gave rise to a type of fundamental theology which set out to establish rationally the fact of divine revelation and of the divine institution of the teaching authority of the Church, and at the same time the necessity for man to accept this revelation and submit to this teaching. In the most extreme manifestations of this tendency there was seen to be no need to examine the content of the revelation or the relationship of it to the human situation.

Those days are over and extrinsicism has given way to genuine attempts to begin apologetics from the situation and existential experience of men, for example in Rahner's transcendental anthropology which by reflecting on the nature of man concludes that he cannot be conscious of himself as a knowing subject without pre-supposing God. Such an approach is different from that which Congar experienced at Le Saulchoir where, in the tradition of Gardeil, the method was of 'fides quarens intellectum' - an intensive study of the Scriptures, Tradition and the magisterium followed by a rational construction of the data. This was how he

himself proceeded in his Faith and Theology but what he would now like to see is an approach, even at the level of the study of the revealed given, where philosophy would play a decisive role. The dangers of 'anthropocentric' dogmatic theology however, mean at the practical level of priestly formation there is the risk of failing to study the great theological masters, together with the real possibility of misunderstanding St. Thomas's thesis that the subject of all theology is God Himself. [Congar 1967c,76-77]

Congar may, as has been said, be good at putting his finger on contemporary problems. What he does not do so often is set down systematically worked out solutions. He does not himself provide an anthropology which concentrates on the personal subject as the place where the divine and human meet, in such a way as to satisfy the modern philosophical enquirer. He approves of Rahner's transcendental approach but has said that he has scarcely responded to his (Rahner's) proposal that theology should re-think and preach the gospel message in such a way that it can be received and understood by the modern non-Christian world. [Congar 1981,409; Rahner 1967]

T.I.MacDonald sees this as a defect in Congar's work. He believes that a more developed anthropology would not only explain the reasonableness of faith, but would have ecclesiological consequences in that it would enable him to show "that the church as a divine/human reality is not entirely extrinsic to the human condition but is constructed on the basis of a fundamental unity between the human and the divine while at the same time maintaining the gratuitousness of grace." [MacDonald 1984, 292.]

It would be unfair to give the impression that Congar is unconcerned with anthropology. It would, however, be true to say that he does not concern himself with the philosophical bringing to belief. Yet Christianity must be concerned with its claim to universal validity and truth if it is to have any credibility in the modern world. It must undertake this task conscious of the fact that its defence of the truth must answer the modern questions about what it means to be human and how Christian existence is to be understood. Father Congar's approach is more in the line of theology done within the believing community. It is scriptural and theological rather than philosophical. He does see the need for theology to-day to recognise the importance of anthropology, but does not himself go beyond a dogmatic anthropology based on the pre-supposition of the existence of God and the validity of Scriptural revelation, although he applauds the efforts of those who do more pioneering work. He also acknowledges that though he is able to point out the questions which need to be answered, the tasks which need to be done, the

fact that he is no philosopher means that he does not have the capacity "to deepen concepts and to systematise thoughts" and so has scarcely responded to the need for a Christian theology for the modern pagan.[Congar 1981, 409.]

T.I.MacDonald also criticises Congar's compartmentalising of Church and world. He says a too rigid dichotomy between the structure and life of the Church means that the structure, the unchanging spiritual element received from God and exercising the power and lordship of Christ by means of its sacraments teaching and ordinances, is deemed to be separate from the world and not to influence it directly but only through the Christian laity.[MacDonald 1984, 190-191]

Guiseppe Alberigo says that Congar's approach to the role of the laity, is really the final flourishing of one particular approach. It is the duty of the laity to 'consecrate' the world by their actions and in effect to act as assistants to, 'collaborators' with, the hierarchy. This is the approach which inspired Chapter IV of Lumen Gentium and much of Apostolicam Actuositatem.[Alberigo 1984,24-34]

Congar is at pains to keep Church and world separate, although allowing for the continuity mentioned above, because he is fearful of collapsing the one into the other, laicising the clergy, clericalising the laity, and re-establishing the dominance of the clerical over the temporal. He commends groups such as Catholic Action, very active in his France, and paralleled by organisations like the Newman Society for Catholic graduates and the Catenian association for Catholic businessmen which flourished in Scotland in the 1950s and 1960s. s approach in Lay People in the Church though it now seems dated, had a very positive aim and a positive result. What Congar wanted to do was to ensure that the lay person was seen to have a role, not just to be a clerical pawn. It may be that he saw the lay role as still too dependent on the hierarchy and the Church as detached from worldly reality, but those who remember how the laity was regarded prior to the Second Vatican Council have to be grateful for Congar's intervention.

The situation of to-day does demand that the Church can no longer hold herself aloof from what is going on in the world. It is perceived that she in her structures must embody the values which are considered by most people to be worthwhile. It is sad but true that for some a perception of the Church and some forms of theology as embodying attitudes which demean, for example women, leads to a rejection not only of the institutional Church but of God Himself.

1c. Salvation.

In pursuit of a theology for to-day Congar is conscious of the fact that theology has to begin at the beginning and give, in terms which satisfy the modern mind, an account of what is meant by salvation, the redemption of the human person, and how it accords with the deepest desires of humankind, however these may be understood. It does seem obvious that the increasing anthropocentrism of theology is connected with answering the questions about salvation, though the approach is not new. Pannenberg says that the foundation for a theological concentration on the human person was already laid in the early Christian faith in the Resurrection. [Pannenberg 1985, 12.]

Christian teaching on salvation has traditionally looked at it from two angles - one which sees salvation as rescue from sin , from death, from the danger of eternal punishment, the other which greets it as entrance into a fullness of happiness which is man's true destiny. The first approach has in the past led to a focusing on sin and a somewhat negative view of man, and is at the root of the atonement theories of redemption. It was in line with this way of thinking that the Church was portrayed as the barque of Peter, rescuing the helpless sinner, and of course it lent itself to adaptation for use by those who wished to justify the existence of poverty and poor social conditions. With the growth of interest in the importance of the human person and personal fulfilment that view has receded along with much of the lively sense of sin that went hand in hand with it. The more optimistic aspect now tends to pre-dominate. Congar says that if, in relation to the world, salvation can mean either to be saved from the world or that the world is saved, then most people will be "resolutely for the second meaning."[Congar 1961,37.] This alone however, he believes, is no more the true way to look at the problem than was concentration on rescue exclusively. It is just as wrong to concentrate on loving one's neighbour to the exclusion of honouring God, as it is to sing His praises totally unconcerned about human misery. He sees such a rift between the first and second commandments, between theology and anthropology, as a " tragic and pernicious thing". A true understanding of salvation entails abandoning the false separation of theology and anthropology which, Congar says, has plagued Christianity for the last three hundred years or so. This connects with his understanding , mentioned above, of the 'co-humanity' being a reflection of Trinitarian life. There must be no separation of loving God from loving man. [Congar 1961, 37] Salvation is both rescue and fulfilment. He notes elsewhere that "Salvation is not merely the rescue of some survivors, but

the consummation in God of all His visible creation, together with man who is the crowning and the immanent goal." [Congar 1969,44]

In the chapter on Salvation in The Wide World My Parish, Congar says that modern atheistic rejections of the idea of salvation as dependence on some transcendental Other, noble as they might be in their aspirations to find meaning enough in this life alone, do not provide the answer to humanity's longing to have a destiny beyond self, beyond one's own possibilities, beyond the frustrations of our lack of freedom, beyond death. The Christian notion of salvation gives meaning to life in terms of hope for the future. [Congar 1961]

John Zizioulas, interpreting the innermost longing of the human being as a desire to be absolutely free in the image of the God who created him or her, has said that however much humanism may struggle to affirm the importance of the individual, the existentialist philosophers have shown that " the person as an absolute ontological freedom is a quest without fulfilment...the human person is not able to free himself absolutely from his 'nature' or from his 'substance', from what biological laws dictate to him, without bringing about his annihilation." [Zizioulas 1985,18,19.]

For Congar humanism cannot be the answer to human questioning and searching. Christian salvation means to have a destiny beyond the possibilities of humanity and the world, beyond death, beyond nothingness. Its accomplishment depends on some-one, God in Christ, beyond the human self, for it is not something that humanity or world can accomplish. It gives meaning to our present lives in the form of hope for the future, hope for rescue from nothingness which alone makes sense of lives here on earth, and in the form of the possibility of freedom from the frustration of existence in the sense that by allowing God to work in us we are brought to our true and proper destiny of being in a right relationship with Him. [Congar 1961,40-42.]

It is on this note that Congar ends his chapter on salvation in what is essentially a pastoral, rather than a theological work .

Congar's emphasis on the necessity of linking theology with anthropology is important and was expressed even before Vatican 11. His thinking was in line with the way the world was developing and exhibited an open-ness to new ideas which is however, restrained by his solid adherence to Scripture and Tradition. Jossua says that Congar's real gift is not speculation but a talent for picking up issues whose time has come. He is convinced " that the genius of Congar is not in speculation - the conceptuality of the great works of his maturity is in fact either borrowed or relatively empirical - but of spiritual intuition about what is

germinating in the Church." [Jossua 1968, 554.] This is borne out by the fact that he chose to write on the Holy Spirit at a time when this was assuming importance in the Churches and would be in keeping with his assertion that a theologian should be first of all a man of prayer. There is also in Congar's works the feeling that he is so attached to his Church, to Scripture and Tradition that he would never willingly step beyond the bounds of orthodoxy. Perhaps his experiences with the Holy Office have intensified a tendency to be tentative, to ask questions rather than answer them.

MacDonald's remarks have already been noted. In addition it must be said, Congar's discussion of anthropology, is conducted almost exclusively in male terms. In Lay People in the Church, for example, he picks up the Biblical testimony to a woman being the first witness of the Resurrection, but as lay person rather than as woman. [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985,281] Since he concludes that such lay witness was "without structural value for that apostolic witness on which faith is to be based....they had to get the hierarchy moving" [ibid.] it is not surprising that there are no feminist inferences drawn. In conversation with Bernard Lauret he picks up briefly the question of the role of women immediately after his mention of the Biblical contribution to an understanding of the human condition and says " the woman is also self-creative, strongly conditioned by her vocation to motherhood, even if she does not exercise it, and by her relationship to the man."[Lauret 1988,31]

Such definition of woman in terms of relationship with man, even if in a conversational rather than an academic work, might be seen as less than satisfactory. There is no mention of taking into consideration the relevant findings of other disciplines here where one might have hoped to have found some discussion of the necessity, in studying Scripture, of taking into consideration the problems posed by historical development. Of course one would not expect much discussion in a book such as the above, but it is interesting that he makes so little reference to current problems in feminist theology. He is of, course, a theologian of his time. Much of his work was done before these issues became so acute. One of the interesting things which he does do is to refer to the possibility of restoring the diaconate for women. This is a current suggestion as a way forward since Pope John Paul II has indicated so forcefully that the reservation of the priesthood to men must be accepted. It is submitted that this option is unlikely to be taken up in the near future.

Looking Forward.

Congar's approach to theological anthropology by focusing on the human being as made in the image of the Trinitarian God who is Love and Communion, is implicitly pneumatological as regards the creation of Man and Woman. God breathed life into them. God has created beings who, because they are like Him, are able to know and to love freely, and to return freely to Him, drawn by the desire in themselves which is " an echo of his own desire which he has revealed to us as his Spirit." [Congar 1983,II,67.] It is noteworthy also that Congar's establishment of the personal and relational nature of human being prepares the way for his consideration of relationship with God in terms of the Holy Spirit. There has been a development in Catholic theology in the second half of the twentieth century which has seen a movement away from the scholastic and neo-scholastic approach to relationship with God, which saw that relationship in terms of a metaphysical understanding of grace, towards one which tried to interpret it in personalist terms. The theologies of Karl Rahner and Henri de Lubac, for example, while still using scholastic terms, do emphasise the personal element. The older approach, which treated the divine/human relationship in terms of grace as something extrinsic added to human nature so as to modify it, led to " a kind of 'superstructure' understanding of grace. " [Duffy 1992, 55.] This, as Congar has noted, runs the risk of objectifying grace and separates it from the acts of the Holy Spirit who is the Uncreated Grace from whom all graces come. [Congar 1983,II,69.] It is better to remember that all grace, all sanctification, comes from God through His Son and His Spirit as part of His relationship with us. It could be said that grace is a relationship, one in which the Spirit has a pre-dominant role since it is the Spirit who mediates the love of the Father and the Son , although it is the love of all Three Persons which brings about our sanctification. It will be seen that Congar discusses man's relationship with God through the Spirit within a basic acceptance of the teaching of his Church. His approach, it is submitted, is one of attempting to increase intelligibility for those within the community rather than one of presenting a radically new apologetic. His anthropology, it seems, comes from the experience of one who lives within the Christian community, who understands himself to be a member of the mystical body of Christ, not in the sense of any false mysticism, but as participating in a 'communion' which has both an external and an interior reality. This view of the Church will be explored in more detail in a later chapter.

2 Life in the Spirit.

2a.The human being in relationship with God.

For Congar, it has been said, theology and anthropology walk hand in hand. By his insistence on the necessity of uniting theology and anthropology he underlines the importance of understanding that the human person is to be understood as related to God as He is in Himself, and the importance also of going beyond the compartmentalisation of theology into separate zones of abstract discussion about God, Creation, Christ, Salvation and Grace. Congar's admonitions remind us of the truth that the reason God created beings apart from Himself was so that He could bring them into relationship with Himself. This is the whole point of the economy of salvation and of the Revelation which makes it known to us. All areas of theology, then, are interconnected as all work together towards the final realisation of the intentions of God. .

Father Congar's inclination towards a Spirit approach to the theology of the religious life of humankind may derive in part from his interest in and sympathy with the teachings of the Eastern churches. His contact with the Russian Theological Academy of St. Sergius opened up for him the emphasis on the infinite love of God for human beings found in Russian Orthodoxy, a concept to which he was greatly drawn, [Puyo 1975,51] and which, it is suggested, accords with reflection on the Spirit as Love found in traditional Western theology. He mentions more than once in his writings, the statement of Orthodox observers at the Second Vatican Council that all that is needed for a treatise de Ecclesia is a chapter on the Holy Spirit to which would be added one on Christian anthropology. [Congar 1983, II,66.] He also notes with approval the Trinitarianism of Orthodox thought. [Lauret 1988,60] In turning to the concept of the Spirit as the theological principle according to which he will organise and interpret this area of theology, which deals with the relationship between God and humanity, it is submitted that Congar is trying to flesh out a theological anthropology which will be true to Scriptural witness and, while being basically undertaken from a believer's point of view, will also satisfy the needs of modern people for an internally coherent portrayal of the Gospel message.

If this area of theology, theological anthropology, is to be truly pneumatological

the Holy Spirit must be incorporated in such a way as to be seen as integral to any understanding of the possibility of communion between the divine and the human, as being in himself the way in which the Father and the Son reach towards humanity and as being the way in which we enter into the life of the Trinity, that is, as being involved in how the relationship of God with humankind is brought about.

2.b.The Spirit as possibility of divine/human contact

Congar accepts Karl Rahner's description of the Trinity of salvation history, which is also the "immanent" Trinity, as one in which " the Father is the incomprehensible origin and the original unity, the Word his utterance into history, and the Spirit the opening up of history into the immediacy of its fatherly origin and end." [Congar 1983, III,12; Rahner 1970,47] The Holy Spirit is that Person of the Trinity through whom contact with history, with the non-divine, is made.

> Within the unity of the Godhead the Spirit is the seal of the mutual giving and love of the Father and the Son; the Spirit is too the starting point of their love's external communication.[Congar 1966, 343.]

The Greek Fathers , with their linear image of the Trinity, perhaps most easily express, through the formula, from the Father, through the Son , in the Spirit, the idea of the Spirit as the one through whom God completes His communication of Himself . In any event, Congar accepts that the Spirit is " the completion, the telos, the teleiosis, in the Tri-unity of God". [Congar 1983, III,147.] The Spirit, then, Congar believes, is the Person to whom communication most properly belongs, (although it is also carried out by the Father and the Son) and it is therefore fitting that it should be through the Spirit that the creature's filial relationship with the Father should be brought about, because within the Trinity he is the term of the Processions. [Congar 1962b, 286-287.]

Any discussion about the Spirit as the possibility and the means of divine/human communication must take place within a wider understanding of how the link between the theology of God as He is in Himself, and that of His activity in creation and redemption, comes about. St. Thomas Aquinas, and St. Augustine before him, spoke in terms of the divine "Missions" of the Word and the Spirit. The Word and the Spirit, who were according to Scripture already in the world at creation (Jn.1,10:Gen.1,2) were also sent from the Father. By these sendings, or missions, the Father, the unoriginate Principle, is linked to the beings He has created by their reception of the ones sent. This is not to say that the Son and the

Spirit move but, according to Congar, that they " make a creature to exist in a new relationship with them. This means that the procession that situates them in the eternity of the Uni-Trinity culminates freely and effectively in a created effect".[Congar 1983, II,8]

The visible mission of the Son is not in doubt for, says Congar, in the Incarnation

> the human individuality brought about by the Spirit in Mary's womb, was at the same time assumed by the Word, the Son, and began to exist through the Person of the Son. This mission was visible because the Word, the Son, who was an expression of the being of God the Father, [Heb.1,3.] was a human appearance of God. It was not a mere theophany but the personal and substantial reality of the Word made flesh.[Congar 1983,II,8]

The invisible missions of the Son and the Spirit are also acknowledged to exist in the effects of grace. There are no visible missions of the Spirit in the sense of phenomena with which he is substantially connected, only signs of his presence such as wind or fire. Indeed the question is whether there is such a thing as a "proper" mission of the Spirit analogous to that of the Son. The Eastern Orthodox Church has always upheld the reality of such a mission of the Spirit - for example Vladimir Lossky, The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church - and tends to distinguish between the work of the Incarnate Word and the Spirit and to understand a time after Pentecost when the Spirit carries out his own mission, acts on his own authority, though always in harmony with the work of Christ. The Western Church, on the other hand, speaks in terms of the continuing mission of Christ after the Resurrection and only allows a mission of the Spirit by "appropriation."

The whole Church, East and West, holds that all activity of the Divine Persons outside the Trinity is carried out by them according to, and through, a divinity which is common to all three. As a result, and since the Persons are "inside" one another (the doctrine of perichoresis or circumincession), all the works "ad extra", i.e. having an effect outwith the Godhead, are works of the entire Trinity,

The theologies of East and West, however, diverge thereafter in the way they deal with this datum. Orthodox theology concentrates on the distinctness of the

Persons. The works ad extra are carried out by the Father, through the Son and brought to completion by the Spirit who proceeds from the Father or from the Father through the Son. There is thus in the economy of salvation a personal mission of the Holy Spirit.

In Western theology where the primary emphasis in Trinitarian thinking may be said to be, since Tertullian, on the unity of the Godhead rather than on the distinctness of the Persons, there is not this 'proper' attribution of actions to one or other of the Divine Persons. The actions of the Trinity are, in the West, understood within the context of efficient causality. It is the divinity as such which is the producer, the efficient cause, of the created effects - salvation for example. This stress on the activity of all three Persons acting together led to the loss of the sense that the three persons were acting in distinctive ways. The result was the development of the doctrine of "appropriations". When it was desired to associate an action with one particular Person it was said that action was appropriated to Him. St. Thomas Aquinas is quoted by Congar as giving a clear, though not unique, explanation.

> To appropriate simply means to connect a thing that is common to something particular. It is certain that what is common to the whole Trinity cannot be connected to what is peculiar to one Person , if the intention is to claim that it is more suitably applied to him than to any other Person. That would destroy the equality of the Persons. What is common to all three Persons can however, be thus connected (to one Person) to the extent that it bears a greater resemblance to what is peculiar to one or other person than to what is peculiar to another. Goodness, for example, is related to what is peculiar to the Holy Spirit, who proceeds as love (and goodness is the object of love). Power is appropriated to the Father, since power is, as such, a beginning and it is peculiar to the Father to be the beginning of the whole divinity. And by the same reasoning wisdom is appropriated to the Son, since it is related to what is peculiar to the Son who proceeds, as a Word, from the Father.[Congar 1983, II,95; Aquinas, De Veritate q.7,a.3]

We pick up, therefore, some resemblance between the personal property which

characterises the Person, in so far as we can arrive at this from meditation on Revelation, and the action with which we are concerned. There seems to be something in the Person which allows us to make the appropriation, ' but we cannot clarify it or say with certainty that there is an attribute peculiar to that one Person that would exclude the other Persons from what is appropriated to the one.' [Congar 1983,II,85.] The fact that the same qualities are not appropriated by all theologians to the same Person indicates that there are difficulties with this approach and that it is in a sense a personal activity - St. Thomas appropriates wisdom to the Son, St. Irenaeus to the Spirit, for example. Nevertheless the normative theological axiom that all the works of God in the world are done by all three Divine Persons, taken with the fact that the sources when speaking of the Spirit, speak also of the Father and the Son, tends to stand in the way of Western theology accepting a " proper" mission of the Holy Spirit. Congar says that what strikes him is that when the New Testament attributes a work to one Person, it also affirms the communion of activity -e.g. Gal. 4,4-6 " God sent his Son to redeem us and adopt us as sons, then sent the Spirit of His Son into our hearts crying 'Abba, Father.' " It describes " a sort of concelebration on the part of the three Persons." [Congar 1983,II,86.]

It might be argued against this that the doctrine of appropriations does not give due weight to the fact that the sources place great emphasis on the role of the Spirit in the life of Christ, at Pentecost and in the life of the Church and of the individual believer. Neither does it take account of the fact that the Incarnation is, at least in some sense, a work of the Son alone.

For himself, Congar notes, that there has been dissatisfaction with it, especially in connection with the work of the Holy Spirit, and that several twentieth century theologians have tried to suggest a different approach. [Congar 1983,II,86-88] Karl Rahner, as has been mentioned in connection with Christology, picks up the thought pattern of the Greek Fathers, suggesting, in The Trinity, that Revelation intends that we should understand a real, not simply appropriated relationship with the individual Persons of the Trinity. Congar concludes from his study of the authorities that though the Persons of the Trinity act together as efficient causal agents they do so according to the order of the processions and the special character of the hypostatic being of each Person.

> The nature, essence or being may be common to the Three, but not in the sense of being a common stock that is somehow prior, even logically prior, to the Persons. Their common essence or existence is situated only in the mutual communication of the processions and being of the Persons (their circumincession or circuminsession). The Three therefore come as one, although his operation is not threefold, but according to the order and characteristics of their hypostatic being.[Congar 1983, II,89.]

It can be deduced, therefore, that Congar understands that the relationship which the Spirit has with the individual accords with what the Spirit is in himself.

So far the discussion has been of the God /World relationship from the perspective of God. From the side of creation, to speak of the human being in relationship with God is to consider how humanity is ontologically structured, created ' in the image of God', in what, this being so, its final destiny consists, and, most importantly, how this end is accomplished.

It has been demonstrated that Congar views men and women as personal beings. As such they are able to communicate by words which convey thought and purpose, to interact with others of their kind initiating contact and receiving a response. God, he believes, is also a personal Being, indeed the one in whose image human beingsare made. Therefore he concludes, it is natural that this God should wish to communicate with the beings He has created and that this communication should take the form of a call to which a response is expected.

Congar accepts the philosophical insights of Rahner and Blondel that human beings have an in-built capacity to be called by God - that is a sign of their transcendence and free will - and finds the source for our knowledge of the relationship which we have with God, beyond what the use of reason and philosophy can tell us, in Scripture.[Congar 1985a,44-45]

This relationship, then, is one between personal beings, each in some sense free, God absolutely so, we within the limit of our human condition. God calls, we respond. That is, the result of call and response is the establishment of a new relationship, a filial relationship, " one of indwelling, of life together, of knowledge and love, in short, of communion and fellowship." [Congar (1957 & 65)1985, 91.]

Any contact between man and God can only result from a divine initiative. This

initiative has two dimensions - revelation, and by virtue of divine grace, the supernatural virtue of faith which enables man or woman to receive that revelation.

2c.Faith .

Faith, the Epistle to the Hebrews tells us, is " the assurance of things hoped for, the conviction of things not seen".[Heb.11,1]. If it is a conviction it is a kind of knowing, but as well as this noetic aspect there is in addition a dynamic one for it is in faith that the Gospel, as well as being accepted and known, accomplishes its saving work. Not that the two aspects can be separated for "The living God reveals and promises; faith in the living God knows and engages." [Congar 1962a,73]

2c.1Faith as knowledge.

In considering the noetic aspect of faith we must remember that when we know we know as human being, in a human, though God- given, way. Believing is assent because that is the way the mind knows truths, but in faith we are not assenting to ordinary propositions, accepting credible testimony, but by **means** of assenting to propositions, we are adhering to, unifying ourselves with, the One whom we are accepting as the very ground of our existence. Schillebeeckx says that " Believing is the existential attitude of the whole man confronted by the ultimate meaning of life."[Schillebeeckx 1967,106]
In faith knowledge and act come together.
From a purely epistemological point of view, according to Congar, the mind of the believer is firmly attached to the object of belief not because of the compulsion of scientific evidence but as a result of an act of the will executed because the person has perceived a link between the option of belief and certain real values, between the good of the person and the promise made by the Word.

> In faith the adherence of the mind is decided by the engagement of the living man in search of his total good recognising it in what the Word offers and promises him.[Congar 1962a, 77]

Faith is not, however, simply a matter of epistemology. Psychology also plays a part and in the psychological process Congar sees four elements at work in the maturation of the decision to believe.

First the object of faith is proposed as eternal happiness, union with God and membership of the Kingdom of the blessed made known and achieved through Christ. [Congar 1962a, 77]

Secondly there must be a certain attitude on the part of the believer, a filial one of openness, submission and welcome. Congar compares it with that of the child wishing to become adult or of the student bent on learning from the master. As distinct from the goods of the material world, that of communion with God is presented in a less compelling, more veiled way, not in the sense that it is less attractive, but in the sense that the evidence is not so strong and the way seems hard. Reason is not bludgeoned into submission, but freedom is allowed free rein and complex moral dispositions assume a great importance. The moral agent is able to perceive, yet not clearly, is drawn to the Good yet open to distraction. There is a kind of dialogue between us and the Truth , with the latter becoming nearer and more desirable the more we welcome it, the closer we approach. For the man of goodwill the Kingdom is not far away. [Congar 1962a,79] This must surely strike a chord in the mind of the reader.

Thirdly we must remember that though we are free we are not alone. Within our freedom God is active through His grace. Scripture and Tradition both assert this. From its very beginning faith has and needs the help of grace, which St. Thomas sees as taking the form of supernatural aid to the intellect to perceive the signs and the witness, to the will to incline it to find its end in the promised alliance. If the process thus set in motion reaches its fruition this will be in the choice of faith and union with God in love, and this is why Congar accepts the interpretation of St. Thomas that sees these inspirations as intrinsically supernatural, not just from the point of view of their goal. Finally the interior call is accompanied by exterior signs. These make the testimony of revelation credible to the rational man, not just desirable. These signs are first perceived by reason alone, but as the process

of opting for faith proceeds, there is interplay between reason and the dispositions of the will, and also the intervention of initiatives of grace, which further the progress to the final act of faith wherein the grasp of reason is powerfully strengthened and rendered more luminous.[Congar 1962a,80.]

2c.2 Signs leading to faith.

Faith is assent to attested truths and there are signs which initiate the process which ends in belief. The object of faith is heard in the voices of witnesses (though the belief is rational it is also religious and this will affect the kind of evidence accepted) Faith comes in the Gospels also, through signs and works. There was a visual as well as an auditory impetus to faith. At the time of Christ those signs were his own person, his teaching and his miracles, especially the Paschal miracle. To-day in addition to the Scriptural record of these, insofar as they are critically established and admitted, there is the Church, the Covenant People of God, which accompanies her witness with physical and moral miracles, the most important of which is holiness. Congar sees the latter as the sign most conducive to faith : "most easily read, most difficult to take exception to."[Congar 1962a,82.]

To-day, it is submitted, when organised religion seems to be in decline in face of a world never more in need of redemption and hope, what better could one do than present the mark and the fruit of holiness to the waiting world. Holiness draws people to itself. There is no more powerful charisma than goodness. The saint best reflects the glory that is God. There are not many saints around and this may be because the path of radical sanctity is too difficult, but perhaps some of the blame might rest with the Churches for how often is this way preached? With the growth of modern psychology and the emphasis on the person there have developed spiritualities centred of personal growth and wholeness, which though presenting useful insights, contain within themselves the danger that the terminus might be found in the person rather that in the God who created that person. There is work to be done on the theology of the mission of the Christian and always the emphasis must be on the return to the centre, the focusing on the Holiness of God, and Congar provides us with a reminder of this.

Congar sums up by saying that faith is supernatural, free and reasonable, but

neither inner attraction nor the reasons prompted by the signs discussed above can be said to be the cause of faith, rather they are what authorise and prepare the way for faith. Faith itself

> is a spiritual novelty constituted by the movement to an unconditional adherence to God, motivated by His authority in revelation, that is to say by the intervention in our mind of the First Truth as He reveals Himself.[Congar 1962a,83.]

2c.3 Faith as a way of life.

Faith, as well as having a noetic dimension has also an existential one. M. D. Chenu (he is referring to the framework in which theology must be understood) speaks beautifully of faith as a personal act of perception and love, which, it is suggested, expresses this aspect.

> Faith is perception...we see, we look, we contemplate. Faith is not a conclusion; it is not a composite of ideas and concepts which permits us to grasp reality. Neither is it a proof; nor is it an explanation of the world, an argument from causality, an apologetic of creation. It is a look, a view. It is a dialogue between my soul and God concerning God Himself; in its light my view joins up with God's own view and with wonder I share in God's knowledge of Himself, of the world and of me....faith is also a work of will and of love. ...The first step is inspired in fact , by the desire for happiness, something primordial and unquenchable in man. It is this which attaches the heart of man to the God who has been discovered, desired and recognised as the source of happiness ; there ensues a process in which the whole human being is engaged, there is a complete surrender of oneself which is entirely different from a more superficial curiosity...the One with whom I began and continue to hold dialogue is the God who I suddenly met on the wayside as I journeyed through life. He is a being as personal as I am. He has given me His interior light, the Holy Spirit...my soul lives. I see in this light. [Chenu 1968, 2]

Faith is the principle of that religious relationship, " God for us and we for God", which culminates in eternal life.[Congar 1962a,71.] Following Scripture's presentation of faith as a personal relationship, Father Congar sees it as the " opening of one person to another person in trust." [Congar 1967d,143.] In spite of the amount of words devoted to faith as knowledge, it is suggested that for Father Congar it is the personal, relational, existential aspect of faith which is the more important. For him the only God is the living God - "there is no other" - **in** Whom we believe, because He is a God who is involved with us, in relationship with us.[Congar 1969,167] He is the God who sent His Word to be the principle of the new creation for those who receive it in faith. Whatever the achievements of theology, the real human purpose is to gain eternal life and faith is not about learning this or that piece of knowledge. " To believe is not to add one or several ideas to those which one already had, but it is to become a new man." [Congar 1935,218.]

2c.4 Faith and the Holy Spirit.

Faith considered as a way of life is of particular interest from the point of view of the involvement of the Holy Spirit. It is by faith that the Word achieves its purpose of bringing us to a new birth and it is here, according to Congar, that theologically the Spirit intervenes. [Congar 1986,12.] He follows Aquinas in his assertion that it is the Spirit who allows humanity to understand and receive the saving teaching of the Word. and cites other examples of the use of this notion in catholic theology. [ibid] He also sets out the Scriptural witness to the union of the Word and the Spirit in ensuring that the word is the word of life. e.g. R.15,18-19., 1 Pet. 1,12., Heb.2,3-4. Because of the role of the Holy Spirit in the reception of the word in faith, Congar feels that, in the tradition of John Chrysostom and Bonaventure, " all preaching should be preceded and accompanied by an invocation of the Spirit, in other words, by an epiclesis." [Congar 1986, 23] This because preaching is seen as more than imparting information about dogma, more than moral exhortation. It is a call to life both for the individual and for the community of believers. Faith is not just a private matter. Faith is what is important in the community, faith lived and expressed, and this by the power and presence of the Holy Spirit. Thus Irenaeus, "where the Spirit is there is the

Church and all Grace" Father Congar on this point stresses that the history of the Church confirms the priority of faith as a way of life over faith as knowledge. Speaking of the early Church he says,

> The first 'canon', the first rule, was the living church. The church formulated its rule of faith and life before the end of the second century, but first of all it had lived it out.....people like Justin and Origen unhesitatingly gave their life for a christological or trinitarian faith which they could not formulate adequately. The faith of the church, its unity, was in the life of the faithful. Progressively, what was felt to be contrary to this life was rejected as heresy, and formulae of faith were imposed as rules for unity.[Congar 1984, 13-14]

Though he is speaking here in the context of ecumenical discussion about the origin of diversity, he indicates his belief in the priority of ' belief in' over ' belief that' which is underpinned by the experiential aspect of faith in which the Spirit is involved. It is in the living Church that the Spirit is present and at work as the principle of the 'communio sanctorum' and it is in this living Church that the faith is passed on.

It is submitted, therefore, that by his particular association of the Holy Spirit as the out-going of God with the receptivity of the human being, as a free personal subject in the image of the Creator, to God's call, Congar ensures that his approach is Trinitarian, internally consistent, and also respects the freedom of the individual.

2d.The Holy Spirit and relationship with God.

The filial relationship which is the term of the work of God in Christ to which the New Testament witnesses, also expressed in terms of newness of life, (Jn.3,3), is the basis for our hope of redemption. Redemption, as well as being union with God, achievement of the 'beatific vision' is understood by Congar as the bringing about of all that man and history strive to attain - victory over suffering and death, the end of all contradiction.[Congar 1961,Ch.6] Congar's interpretation of this relationship between God and man is worked out in terms of the Holy Spirit,

his indwelling in us and our life in him.

The whole point of Christian existence is to live orientated towards a future hope which has been made known to us in Christ, to believe that God has given Himself to us and for us in such a way as to change our whole understanding of existence and the very form of that existence. Scripture speaks of us being made children of God, living in a new way, no longer enslaved but free. For Congar to live the Christian life, the life as son of God , is expressed as living in the Spirit and according to the Spirit. To say that we are sons of God is to tell us that a new relationship of a particular kind has been established between us and our Creator. To say that this is life in the Spirit is to go further, to expand on the nature of that relationship and to try to explain the way in which God's self-communication interacts with the Christian person as an individual and as a member of the Church. It was always God's intention to bring the community of the human family into the communion of His own being. The Spirit, however we try to theologise about how he is person, is revealed to us as God's gift, meditated upon in theology as the love of the Father and the Son in person, the 'We' of their relationship in person, and he is sent to draw us into the unity which Christ has with the Father, to be the way the Father and the Son are present to us. An approach to understanding the relationship between God and humanity principally in terms of the Holy Spirit, rather than in traditional terms as one of sanctifying grace, is one which can accommodate the personal and the experiential because it is through the Spirit as Uncreated Grace in person, that we experience the presence of the Father and the Son, each one in his or her own way. This it is submitted adds to the explanatory power of the theology of this area, important at a time, as Congar has recognised, when the whole field of personal relationships is seen to be of great concern and there is interest in the religious experience of the individual. It also, it is suggested, is a reminder that discernment about the appropriateness of courses of action can take place by measuring them against the 'fruits of the Spirit'. The Spirit who is love and gift cannot bring dissension or dismay.

2d.1 The gift of the Spirit before and after Christ.

That Congar attaches outstanding importance to the connection of the fullness of life to which God calls humanity to life in the Spirit given at Pentecost can be deduced from the fact that he, unlike most writers in the Western tradition, differentiates between the way God makes Himself present and makes His people holy under the old dispensation and the way He does so in the Messianic era.

The view of the Latin Fathers, and of St. Thomas Aquinas and the Scholastics, was that though the Old law could not bring about justification, those who lived under it were justified by their implicit faith in the Christ who was to come. Such writers understood no essential difference in the gracing of human beings before and after Christ. (There were certainly accidental differences such as the fact that the graces received in Old Testament times were rarer and less universal.) Congar believes that the understanding of almost all Western theologians, and that of Popes Leo XIII and Pius XII, was that believers before Christ were personally justified by reason of their faith, had the quality of being sons of God and were indwelt by the Holy Spirit. On such an understanding "All that the Incarnation and Pentecost brought about was a wider and more abundant dissemination of that grace and that presence of the Spirit." [Congar 1983,II,75.]

The Fathers of the Church in the East, however, took a different view. They took the Scriptural texts more literally and on this basis concluded that there was a difference in the condition of grace before, and that after, Christ. Congar says that John Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria regarded John 7,39 - "as yet the Spirit had not been given because Jesus was not yet glorified" - as decisive. St. Paul was taken seriously when he contrasted the mission of the Spirit with that of Moses, (2 Cor.3,3-18) as was the epistle to the Hebrews with its references to the impotence of the Law, (7,19; 9,9f.;10,1;11,9-13) The just in the Old Testament were individually and personally justified on account of their faith and holiness, but this was brought about by allowing them to benefit in advance from the redemptive system proper to the Messianic era. [Congar 1962b,267.] The divine gifts which these holy people were given were gifts in preparation for the coming of Christ, "gifts with a specific active purpose, (power, prophecy, miracles) not a personal and substantial indwelling of the Holy Spirit." [Congar 1962b, 264.] It is to be remembered that this is in the context of the Eastern anthropology which

understands human nature as being once more body soul and spirit because it shares in the spirit of the God/Man. From the anthropological point of view a 'new man' comes about at the level of human nature which of course has to come into existence personally in each individual.

Congar's own position follows that of the Greek Fathers which he finds closer to the facts and the biblical texts. Their approach also fits in with his understanding of the way in which salvation comes about in a historical form. He holds that the events of salvation history bring about a real change in the way in which God relates to human beings. Thus by means of the covenant with Abraham, the Incarnation, the Death and Resurrection of Jesus, the outpouring of the Holy Spirit at Pentecost, "something was changed in the relationship of the human race with God." [Congar 1962b,279.] It follows that the situation of the just in Old and New Testament times was radically different. According to Congar the difference was expressed using the terminology of created and uncreated grace by Mgr. Waffelaert, Bishop of Bruges, saying that the righteous in the Old Testament received created grace and so could act supernaturally and acquire merit, whereas the just under the New Covenant by virtue of uncreated Grace, the Holy Spirit, given to and dwelling in them, were given the quality of sons and heirs of their heavenly Father.[Congar 1962b , & 1983,II,75.]

Canon Gerard Philips, Congar says, while accepting, with the West, that there is only one justifying grace of Christ, tries to incorporate the insights of Irenaeus and Cyril as to the qualitative difference between the time before and that after Christ, by saying that grace is an actuality created by the Uncreated Act. In the Old Testament the grace is an inner justification but is conditioned by being in the time of preparation. There is the necessity of a new actuation linked with the historical missions of the Son and the Spirit.[Philips, 1947,1948]

Congar's own understanding is expressed in quite similar terms. He holds

> that a distinction must be made, even to the point of total separation, between certain effects of grace and grace itself, and between the supernatural righteousness granted to the patriarchs and the effectiveness of that grace in obtaining its fruits of sonship, the substantial indwelling of the Divine Persons and divinization. [Congar 1983,II,75.]

Congar explains that he was criticised by his fellow Dominicans when he submitted these ideas to them in 1954. "What, they asked, was a grace that does not make us sons and does not reach the Father?...Could justification and the possession of the divine Persons be separated in this way?" [Congar 1983, II,76.] In spite of the criticism Congar continues to assert that since the economy of salvation is historical its events must bring about real change and the new revelation given in Christ must be understood as increasing our knowledge and consciousness of what grace is.

> It is inconceivable that the incarnation of the Son, Christ's Easter and glorification and the coming of the Spirit who was promised should have changed nothing and should have brought nothing new. Until that time something was lacking and the gift of the Spirit was not complete. It is still not complete, of course, since in the present era we only have the first fruits of the Spirit.[Congar 1983,II,77.]

Behind Congar's view lies the understanding that grace is not an object given but a free divine act of love. Presumably God may dispense it as He wishes and in the manner in which He wishes. We might ask whether creation binds God, in the sense of entailing salvation, but He is not bound to give us sonship. There is nothing which stops Him from interacting with those of an earlier stage in the plan of grace in a different way from that in which he acts with those who come after Christ, though for justification the passion and death of Christ must be presumed. The key points in this interpretation are the importance accorded to the historical nature of the economy of salvation and the gratuity of grace. There is it is submitted a similarity between the way Congar understands this development of grace with the way he understands the historical development of Christ's sonship for us.

2d.2 Life in Christ, Life in the Spirit.

The Spirit then, brings , in Congar's view, something new. The first thing that the Spirit accomplishes in us is to make us live 'in Christ'. Pneumatological theology must present the Spirit as an ever present thread running through all areas which

it discusses, indeed must consider the Spirit as setting the parameters within which all its reflection takes place. In seeing the redeemed life within a pneumatological horizon one is safely within Scriptural boundaries. The New Testament witnesses to the Son sent from the Father, living as one bearing the Spirit, and after his death, as he is risen Lord, sending that Spirit to humanity. The same Spirit who is in Christ is in Christians. Paul understands the Christian life as effected by the Spirit. " You are not in the flesh, you are in the Spirit, if in fact the Spirit of God dwells in you .... If the Spirit of him who raised Jesus from the dead dwells in you, he who raised Christ Jesus from the dead will give life to your mortal bodies also through his Spirit which dwells in you." (Rom.8,9 & 11) Not only does the Spirit bring about the contact between the divine and the human, but it is in pneumatological language that the Christian is spoken of in his or her personal spiritual life and also in relation to life in the community of the Church.

Human persons are then, mystically assimilated to Christ by the Spirit in such a way that they participate in his Resurrection. (R.8,9,11) Christ is in them through his Spirit in such a way that they are in him; this comes about because the Spirit 'dwells' in us. The word indwelling suggests permanence and decisive action. The Word of God has been present in his creation since the beginning of time. Even more, from the beginning God had promised to dwell with His people, (Ex.29, 45-46, Lev. 26,11-12). In the time of the Patriarchs this presence was intermittent, but in the Mosaic period it became permanent as God marched with His people, although, Congar says in such a presence was still far from " the indwelling that will result from the realities and gifts of the messianic era." [Congar 1962b,17.] Congar sees in the Pauline and Johannine uses of the term notions of covenant relationship and communion with God together with the idea "of being in a state in which one is the true temple in which God dwells and where He is given spiritual worship." [Congar 1983,II,80.]

In considering how the indwelling takes place Congar sets out the most common understanding as found , he says, among the disciples of St. Thomas Aquinas. God is present where He is active. Thus He is present in creation, when He brings into being bodies who are not Himself but who are placed in a relationship with Him. The relationship brought about by the creative acts of God is not the same as the relationship brought about by the transforming redemptive acts by which

He makes us His own. God is substantially present in creation as a cause of being and doing because His action is Himself. There is an additional and different way in which God is present to us, and a different way of being connected to Him. This is the redeeming or deifying relationship we have with Him. He becomes present to us as the end of what Scripture tells us is a filial relationship, "that is as the object of knowledge and love." in such a way that we really possess Him.[Congar 1983,II,83.] Congar explains that there are really two aspects - that of substantial presence and that of relational or personal presence. Substantial because, according to St. Thomas

> In the procession of the Holy Spirit.....as including the gift of the Holy Spirit , it is not enough for just any new relationship to exist between the creature and God. The creature must have a relationship with God as with a reality that it possesses , because what is given to someone is, in a sense possessed by him. [Congar 1983, II,94; I Sent.d.14,q.2.a,2,ad.2]

We will possess this divine gift perfectly when we are in heaven. at present we enjoy it imperfectly through sanctifying grace

> ...or rather the Divine Person is given to us in the form of that by which we are united to him in order to enjoy him, in that the divine Persons leave in our souls, by a certain impression of themselves, certain gifts through which we formally enjoy (them), those of love and wisdom. It is because of this that the Holy Spirit is called the pledge of our inheritance. [Congar 1983,II,94]]

It is also a personal relationship. Whereas the Western Church expresses the union with God in terms of sanctifying grace, the Greek Fathers attributed it to the Holy Spirit, that is, to uncreated Grace. The danger with the former is that of objectifying the relationship whereas the Eastern approach reminds one more of the personal aspect. Congar is aware of this and points out that St. Thomas and others acknowledged that logically and causally the Spirit preceded the created grace which unites us with God. This sort of reminder is very common in Congar's work because of his immense knowledge of the sources and of the way

they were distorted by the later schools. It is also indicative of his desire to see the Church acknowledge its full catholicity and to incorporate the richnesses of the traditions of East and West.

Given that there is a real divine presence in the soul is it a personal indwelling of the Holy Spirit? The problem of whether this indwelling is something really and exclusively the property of the Holy Spirit or whether it is an activity of the whole Trinity simply appropriated to the Holy Spirit has already been raised. Congar, as has been said above, indicates that he is in sympathy with the view that accords certain personal properties to the Trinitarian Persons. This is confirmed by the way he handles the statements of other theologians.[Congar 1983, II,96,n.33.] When God as Trinity communicates with the individual soul there is a communion of activity but the Three come " according to the order and characteristics of their hypostatic being." [Congar 1983,II,89.] His thinking is in line with those who see sanctification as belonging, not exclusively to the Spirit, but to the Spirit in a way which does not apply to the other two Persons. He speaks approvingly of the work of M.J.Scheeben although not accepting all the conclusions he reaches.[Congar 1983, II,88] This is interesting because Scheeben tries to accommodate an advance on the doctrine of appropriations without abandoning the neo-Scholastic approach. There are some appropriations which have a 'proper' reference to one Person but this is not exclusive of the others. In particular he emphasises the personal indwelling of the Spirit.

This dissatisfaction with a narrow appropriation theology would be the majority view to-day when most theologians in the West have accepted the importance of the contribution of the Greek Fathers. They, while preserving the principle that the works of God towards His creation are the work of the Persons of the Trinity acting together, would attribute a more individual role to the persons. It must be remembered, however, that they were working within a different philosophical climate, thinking in terms of the soul participating in the divinity in terms of formal or semi-formal causality.[Congar 1983,II,92] Basil of Caesarea makes this clear in chapter twenty six of The Holy Spirit The Holy Spirit would mould or transform the soul into the image or likeness of God by giving it the 'form' or dimension of holiness without losing any of His transcendence.(semi-formal causality) The imprint of the Spirit is left on the soul while he himself remains separate. Cyril of Alexandria speaks of the Spirit as imprinting the image of the

divine essence in us, impressing himself like an invisible seal on the wax of our hearts. This expresses in other words the idea of formal or semi-formal causality.
Congar while not wanting to create a theology which is simply a mixture of all possible elements believes that thinking of the return of man in the Spirit through the Son to the Father in terms which take full account of the New Testament and patristic texts which speak of a mission and gift of the Spirit culminating in his indwelling in us, ensures that one understands more profoundly what is meant by saying that the Trinitarian image of God is realised in the sanctified soul. That is, the way the soul relates with Father Son and Spirit reflects the way that the Three relate with one another in the intra-Trinitarian life. Sanctification does not belong exclusively to the Spirit, but because of his order of procession in the Trinity he is the bond which unites us to the persons of the Trinity. Because, according to Cyril of Alexandria, holiness is of his essence as sweetness is of the essence of honey, it expresses his essential quality , and so sanctification belongs to him in a way that it does not belong to the other two Persons. What is to be avoided, however is any suggestion that by indwelling is meant any union of being between the soul and the Holy Spirit .
The first conclusion to be drawn from this exploration of Congar's theology of the involvement of the Spirit in the relationship between God and the human being is that he, in spite of the fact that he is not saying anything totally new, makes a significant contribution because from what he draws out in his study of Scripture and Tradition we can go on to link the doctrine of God as He is in Himself with the doctrine of salvation. This is done by his reminding us that it is because of who and what the Spirit is revealed to us as being within the Trinity, that he can act as he does in relationship to us. As has been explained above the Spirit is seen, for example, as by nature unconfined, able to be in everything and everyone without changing them (cf Wisdom) and entirely relational in his being. It is fitting that since the Spirit is God, who is love, outside Himself it is the Spirit who returns men and women to their God.
Secondly by going beyond the doctrine of appropriations he emphasisesthat the soul made holy " is placed in a relationship with the three Persons as the term of its knowledge of faith, of supernatural love, and often of experience (and that)...in its relationship of ascent back to God the soul has a special connection with each of the three Persons." [Congar 1983, II,89-90.] He is not saying that the work of

sanctification is exclusive to the Spirit, but rather that the Spirit is involved in it in a way that the other two Persons are not, and this because of who the Spirit is. While he follows Rahner in stressing the importance of the connection between the way God acts towards us and the way He is in Himself- essential for the concept of trusting in God - he protects the transcendence by reminding us that we cannot grasp the whole of what God is, through the economy, or indeed in any way. Nevertheless what we do know of the Spirit from Revelation and the reflective theological tradition seems to Congar to allow us to conclude that the Spirit works in the soul to make it holy, intensify in it the image of God, and relate it to the Trinitarian God in faith and love, and often also, in experience.

Such an approach which goes beyond pure appropriation makes it more possible to think in terms of a personal relationship. It is submitted that it also makes sense for the spiritual life of the individual if he can understand himself as having a particular relationship with each Person rather than with a common 'essence' of divinity, and it is interesting that Congar finds this to be borne out by the experience of the mystics. Mystical knowledge was understood by the scholastics as being an exception to the normal knowing through the senses and the intellect. It was infused into the soul through love.(John of the Cross, The Dark Night of the Soul,2,17,2) This accords with the notion of the Spirit who is love and dynamism working in the soul, forming Christ in the soul. This perception is not the preserve of the great mystics but can be the ordinary Christian experience of being transformed, of becoming more Christ-like, of being truly a son or daughter of the Father. William Johnston says that the art of mysticism in action is to listen for the promptings of the Spirit who does not usually speak " in clear-cut words and concepts but only through inspirations and movements which are dark and obscure"[Johnston 1981,28] In this sense it could be said that all are called to be mystics.

The ability to relate to the Persons is important for the prayer-life of individuals. Some cannot progress in prayer, understood as relational unity with God, because they are inhibited by the thought of the unapproachable nature of the divine , the result of a non-personal approach. Some relate only to Jesus Christ since he actually lived a human life, though one which revealed the nature of God. Vladimir Lossky accuses Western spirituality of having lost a Trinitarian focus and to be directed, if not simply to Jesus, to a unitive vision with the essence of

God, anathema to Eastern understanding that God in His essence is unreachable, being knowable only in His energies. Prayer as a religious experience can only be defined in relation to the object of that experience, God as Trinity.

2e.The Spiritual Life - Spirituality.

It is now necessary to consider whether Congar uses the Spirit to improve one's understanding of men and women as spiritual beings, both individually and as members of the Church. This might be said to be the existential application of what has gone before. When Congar speaks of the spiritual, filial life being in the Spirit and according to the Spirit he obviously means something more than the sense of human 'spirituality' in which man, who knows himself to be more than body, defines himself in terms of his spiritual quality. It is also to go beyond the affirmation of a transcendent something permeating the whole of existence. It is a way of interpreting how it is that the Absolute, Transcendent God can and does affect the present real life of humanity and its future and if perceived to take place primarily within the community of the Church. The work of the Holy Spirit is to make the Christian live "in Christ", to bring about the spiritual identification with Christ which is expressed in terms of membership of his Body. This 'mystical assimilation' is brought about by the personal indwelling presence of the Spirit in the individual and by faith, the gift of God on the basis of which the Spirit is given, but which is itself the work of the Spirit and is to be understood as something living and lived. It is not just in the initial stages that the Spirit is active for he deepens and nourishes faith throughout the individual's life. [Congar 1983, II,100-102] The two, faith and the Spirit are deeply inter-twined, reciprocally active. We enter into the communitarian life of the Church whose principle is the Spirit, that is, we are justified, by faith. By faith, which is pure gift, we respond to God by responding to His Son and it is on the basis of this faith that the living Spirit of God is given to us - Gal.3,2,5. &3,14. The whole process is Trinitarian.

One of the purposes of this justifying relationship which the individual enters by faith and the Spirit is that Christ the revealer of the Father might be himself revealed. Christology and Pneumatology are brought together in a return to the Christological notion that the Spirit is part of the very constitution of Christ and as such not only knows Christ intimately but is the possibility of Christ's being for others. It is this same Spirit, who is present in Christ who is at work in us. It is inevitable and fitting that the Spirit who knows the depths of God and is the one

who makes Christ the universal saviour should be the one who "can enable us to reach the depths of the theandric truth of Christ." [Congar 1983, II,103.]

This life in Christ to which the Spirit brings us is not an end in itself. Christ points always to the Father and does all things for the Father. Life in Christ the Son has as its purpose that we should live also as sons and be brought to heaven through Christ, the only way, (John 3,13) "That is why God constituted in Jesus a unique relationship of perfect sonship with Him as Father and why he calls us to enter into communion with His Son." [Congar 1983,II,105.]

Life in the Spirit then, is to allow the Spirit of God, the Spirit of Christ, within each one, to teach us how to be sons and daughters of the Father, to teach the way to respond to the human situation, for it is true man -in -this -world who lives this spiritual life.

Christian life will, then, incorporate a 'spirituality', a practical interpretation of the basic premise. The modern human subject, whose viewpoint has been shown to be important in Congar's thought, is not someone who can simply be told what to do. Rules for behaviour or the spiritual life must be integrated with an understanding of God, of man, and of the relationship between them. It must be decided what the pneumatological input is and whether or not it is helpful.

Congar follows the traditional way of seeing the working out of our filial relationship with God, our communion with Christ, taking the form of a life of obedience to the will of God and a union with Christ in prayer to the Father. Such a life enables the Spirit to do his work of transforming us into images of the Son. It is noteworthy that Congar believes that this way of life should be carried out without renouncing "our intelligence and our dignity as men." [Congar 1983, II,105]

There is a type of spirituality, seen more widely in the past than to-day, but still present, which demands just the kind of blind subordination rejected by Congar here. This was the kind of spirituality which demanded unquestioning obedience to a director. While in no way advocating the spiritual pride which acts as if the individual, not God, is arbiter of right and wrong, it is submitted that God intended us to use the reason He gave us in interpreting His will, even if the decisions reached must also be subjected to the process of spiritual and prayerful discernment. Congar is following St. Thomas in according to human reason a place in the discovery of the will of God. This is connected with the natural law,

the participation in the eternal law by rational creatures who according to Aquinas, share in the divine reason itself, and derive therefrom a natural inclination to actions and deeds which are fitting. (S.T,I,II,q,91,a,2) It was by the use of reason in this way that the theory of the "just war" was developed in order to regulate matters in the area of the taking of human life. Killing is an intrinsic evil. There is a presumption that life is sacred and a case must be made by reason before that presumption can be re-butted. It may seem that natural law morality, being related to the nature and end of man, should be unchanging. Man, however, is a changing being. His perceptions change with time and circumstances. Reason may be seen to have mis-led at an earlier date, moral decisions may have rested on out-moded scientific or biological knowledge. The fact that our reason is flawed and we may make mistakes is not however cause enough to abdicate responsibility. This state is but an aspect of our human situation. It is a part of the problem of the tension between the already and the not-yet, between the fact that we have the guarantee that we will be fully sons of God, but the reality will only be in the life hereafter. As Christians, in the Spirit, human beings strive to live as best they can in the knowledge that they are called to holiness and destined, if they live rightly, to share eternal life with the Father, the Son and the Spirit.

It is said that human beings 'merit' this eternal life, although no-one can do so of him or her self. Any normal understanding of the idea of 'meriting' eternal life, of the idea of judgement, involves the idea of freedom, of free choice of action. Duress is a defence in law. However, if what is spoken of is meriting nothing less than communion with God Himself, " the good action of our freedom must be borne up by a power of the order of God Himself. That power is Christ...It is also the Holy Spirit."[Congar 1982,II,108]

That is to say that it is only that which is of God which can return to God. There must be some divine element which brings it about that our freely chosen good actions become passports to eternal life.

> Merit only exists because of grace and assumes that the Spirit is 'sent ' and given in the gift of grace and that it is through his divine dynamism that we are able to return through the Son to the Father. [Congar 1983,II,108.]

Although Congar here protects the gratuity of grace by ensuring it is understood that God as love takes the initiative in our moral lives through the promptings of grace, we still have to co-operate and our human state entails a frailty characterized by a tendency to go against our calling to holiness. This is known from experience. It is known what should be done but the effort needed sometimes seems too much; and this at all different levels from that of the avoidance of serious sin to the struggles of the saints with minor imperfections. It is in this struggle that human freedom engages with the grace of God. All is from Him but people are not 'God's marionettes'. If salvation is to be anything other than determined, my acts must be mine. It is submitted that, together with his consistent emphasis on the role of the Holy Spirit in God's gracious workings with the human individual, Congar allows for the action of human freedom in the religious life . Indeed by interpreting the relationship of humanity with God primarily in terms of the Spirit he emphasises the aspect of the individual acting with rather than acted upon. The Spirit does not compel. The Spirit , inherently relational, offers himself as the possibility of personal relationship with God. Although the initiative is always and must always be acknowledged to be from God (and using the word grace makes this apparent) there is a place for human freedom. To use the concept of the Spirit in this context is to emphasise that our relationship with God takes place within a free personal relationship in which there is an element of partnership. Grace is salvific unity with the Father the Son and the Holy Spirit and not just the means to that end. It is relationship and ought therefore to be expressed in personal rather than objective terms.

Before one can engage in this personal relationship there must be a conversion, a turning away from evil to the good. The Spirit is involved in this enabling the world to recognise its guilt -(Jn.16,8.) Congar says that while exegetes differ as to whether the conviction of sin, which is the work of the Spirit, is brought about in the consciousness of the world or in the minds of the disciples, his own view inclines to the former interpretation, that the Spirit plays a part in the conversion of the world, although the Spirit also makes us know our own sin and selfishness, at the same time, however, as we know grace and forgiveness.

> He makes us .... conscious of the sovereign attraction of the Absolute, the Pure and the True, and of the new life offered to us by the Lord, and he also gives us a clear consciousness of our own wretchedness and of the untruth and selfishness that fills our lives. We are conscious of being judged, but at the same time we are forestalled by forgiveness and grace, with the result that our false excuses, our self-justifying mechanisms and the selfish structure of our lives break down.[Congar 1983, II,123.]

It is relevant in this context, that in John's gospel the presence of the Spirit in the Church is linked with the ability to forgive sin.[J.20, 21-23.]
The difficulty which the individual has in living out the life opened up to him by the Spirit is sometimes expressed as the struggle between the spirit and the flesh - Gal.5,16-18.,6,7-8. The Testaments Old and New provide the language of flesh and spirit. 'Flesh' in the Old Testament signifies creaturely physical reality; it is not evil, for it is God's gift, but dependent, frail. What is evil is to trust in the flesh rather than in God. [Schweizer 1981,20; Jer.17,5] God Himself is designed as 'Spirit' the opposite of all that is human, but he also put a spirit, or His Spirit into men and women. (Ezek.36,26-27) It is this action of God, which allows human beings to do His will, keep the law and go beyond the earthly. This will in the future be a universal event. (Joel 2,28-29) This time of promise is inaugurated by the life, death and resurrection of Jesus of Nazareth.(Acts 2,16f)
Paul (Rom.8,13: Gal.5,16;6,7-8) expresses the struggle between good and evil in terms of flesh and spirit that is, the battle between two conflicting inner propensities. (Western texts have here 'soma' for 'sarx' indicating in what sense 'body' was understood at an early date) Acting according to one's sinful proclivities instead of those which are proper to members of the body of Christ, brings death, whereas acting according to the spirit brings the gifts and fruits of that Spirit.(R.12,6-8;Gal.5,22-23) These are the gifts and the good actings which the Spirit initiates and upholds, all with a view to the common good.(1Cor.12,7) As Jesus himself noted, the outcome of the struggle manifests itself not only in what we say but also in what we do, and Congar believes that " the relationships between man and God are so closely connected with the relationships between man and his brothers that Scripture insists 'He who does not love does not know God.' (1Jn.4,8.)" [Congar 1983,II,120.]

To act with concern for every human being reveals the love of God for all. Thus Paul condemns a Eucharist which does not display such love.(1 Cor.11,17,20-26) Congar has always understood the necessity of a spirituality which takes account of the world and the things of the world. It is relative to resolving the paradox that Christian life means a kind of dismissal of the things of this world, concentration on which aspect leads to the monastic path of flight from the world, while it is at the same time an affirmation of them as God's free gifts. The resolution comes about in the proclamation that we only truly possess these goods when we acknowledge that they exist only from God and for God. [Congar 1969,135- 142.]

The development of this kind of spirituality is life-long. It does not happen all at once. Congar talks of the process of 'synergy' by which we make ourselves through our actions yet the work is that of God through His Spirit.[Congar 1983,II,70,121] Scripture asserts that this work is inseparable from suffering and sacrifice just as the Resurrection is inseparable from the Cross. The Christian life is lived in the weakness of the flesh in a not yet wholly transformed world. The problem of suffering is probably the greatest stumbling block for those seeking God. The traditional pious exhortation that it should be offered up to God can appear blasphemous to the non-believer and can only really be understood within a faith relationship. However, on the experiential and spiritual rather than the philosophical level, the dis-engagement from and re-acceptance of all this world's goods as existing not for the sake of the individual but for God, helps to incorporate the pain and suffering entailed by the loss of such goods as children, health, family or possessions, into a holy life. Suffering is part of the tension between the already and the not-yet and, Congar believes, is part of the logic of the Christian life, for as Paul tells us " the power of God (as Spirit) is affirmed in man's distress." [Congar 1983, II,122.] He makes no attempt to deal with the problem of evil or of suffering at a philosophical level and does not, it is submitted, make an integration of the Cross central to his theology.

This whole area is one involving great practical difficulty. There are innumerable pitfalls. One must not dismiss the difficulties people have with reconciling the evils of suffering with the existence of a good God. One must avoid the danger of presenting suffering and deprivation as in some sense good in themselves. This is emphatically not so. There is a narrow line to be followed; suffering is part of the

not-yet of redemption but still one must devote all possible resources to finding ways of combating the injustices of this world, to over-coming what evils one can. The aim is to build the Kingdom, to help man go beyond his human limitations, to try to love as God loves. An emphasis on building the Kingdom in time is a necessary corrective of a spirituality which is too concerned with the "other-worldly" in the bad sense of romantically fastening on it to escape the very real problems of the here and now. This can be seen to be Congar's view when he says that "From a theological point of view this indicates the lack of a sound doctrine of man and a latent monophysitism, that is, the real conditions of human nature are dodged." [Congar 1969,146.]It also, it is submitted, indicates a defective doctrine of God. [cf. Schillebeeckx 1990,130] Men have real needs to be met and real questions to be answered. The Church, for it is in the ecclesial community that the life of faith is lived, must develop an adult spirituality to meet this need.

2e.1 The Spiritual life in practice.

It is all very well to say that the Spirit is at work in us but people need in fact to be made aware of this. They must be taught to listen to the promptings of the Spirit and indeed to ask that Spirit for enlightenment. However well the theory of the love of God and the need to live the good life is known, it is only when one experiences the reality of the religious relationship with God that one is changed. I may acknowledge and say in prayer that God is the rock of my salvation, that He holds me in the palm of His hand, that my salvation consists in living as He wills, but until I accept that deep within my very self, in the same place that I know that my parents, my spouse, my children, love me, it will not affect the way that I am as a person. This acceptance is the work of the Spirit, who has been described as the love God has for Himself and is also the love of God opening to mankind. It is disclosed in silence and in prayer.

Father Congar is fond of referring to the great mystics - Teresa of Avila, Marie de L'Incarnation - who testify to a spiritual experience of such union with God that it seems that the divine Persons dwell in them to such a degree that they speak of 'spiritual marriage.' Most people do not aspire to such heights but can experience the Spirit as "a spontaneous and practical sense of certainty" that the Lord is at work in them.[Congar 1983, II,82.] It is this experience which helps one abandon oneself and one's desires and allow the Spirit to pray in and with one.

There is a great need to-day for teaching about prayer and when Congar says that prayer is "a theologal activity open to every Christian who practices the spiritual life and is not dependent on the special grace of the mystical life " [Congar 1983, II,114.] he is helping in its de-mystification and preparing the ground for those who are at work in parishes. Some recent surveys reported in the popular press suggested that a very high proportion of the population, bearing no relation to the size of the Church-going sector, prays at some time. The desire is there but it must be harnessed and directed. It must also be encouraged for in a world geared to the short attention span, to 'sound-bites', the development of the spiritual life and prayer is difficult. It needs time, it needs quiet and it needs help. Of course the main work is that of the Spirit in us, but though our part may be small it is also necessary. This is Father Congar's view and "It may be too commonplace to

say so, but it comes down to this: the essential pre-supposition is that we should really love God ... our task is to ensure that God will be a living Person in us and the most important thought in our lives."[Congar 1983, II,115.]

Here once more is the idea of relationship with God as something active. The view that prayer is relational is connected with the theological ordering which places importance on the role of the Spirit in the life of the Christian. The presence of the pure, subtle penetrating Spirit [Wisdom 7,22] leads to an openness to the divine which is the pre-requisite of prayer and also to a heightening of the community aspect of that prayer. This is pre-eminent in the liturgy, the People of God praying together, but it is important for individual prayer in that this often needs the help of others in the community of the faithful, and because that prayer should result in our turning more to others, in Christ, in the Spirit. It is the growing importance placed on the Spirit in theological reflection on the Christian living in the world, as in Congar's approach, that has led to such developments in the last twenty years as the use of the word 'sharing' to mean the communication of information or experiences which are conducive to prayerful reflection, and also to the development of renewal programmes in groups or parishes. These have replaced the older authoritarian "Missions" with the concept of people together trying to live a more authentic Christian life.

2f.The Spirit makes us free.

Congar understands by the freedom of the children of God, that Christianity is not a law or a morality imposed on us, but " an ontology of grace which involves...certain attitudes that are called for and even demanded by the way we are." [Congar 1983,II,128.] Thus freedom results from the presence of the Spirit within us " making us free because he compels us from within and through our very own movement." [Congar 1983,II,126.] That is, the Spirit of God is the love with which God loves within Himself, and when given to us that same Spirit recalls to our minds that we are made in the image of this loving God. Indeed he does more - makes us so long to live the life of love that we can do no other.

It seems that until complete acceptance of one's status as child of God, a real brother or sister of Christ, comes about the struggle to live the moral life is difficult because it is just that, a struggle. Human beings are trying to bring

themselves up to some external standard . In that sense the law holds them captive. When they have allowed the Spirit to work within them to bring them to faith and conversion they are so orientated towards the Good and the True that their actions reflect this and emerge as conforming to the " law of liberty." [Jas.2,12.] The Spirit does not compel but, while being the possibility of redemption in humanity, leaves individuals as free persons, who as children of God love as Christ loved. The Christian is the one exhibiting the fruit of the Spirit -Gal.5,22.- the product of the action of the Holy Spirit in us " peacefully and joyfully ready to welcome, and calmly and patiently open to love his fellow men." [Congar 1983,II,138.] Congar does not think that this means that being a child of God commits one to be unconcerned with this world's history. The Holy Spirit links the real transcendence of God and His immanence. We are sons of God, but we are also brothers of the Son and of one another. Both aspects must be retained. Congar quotes a Mgr. Matagrin in L'Européen 160-161(July-September1976) 7.

> One of the risks of Christianity to-day is the split between a political Christianity without a sense of God's transcendence and a spiritual renewal without a historical incarnation. [Congar 1983, II,141,n.22]

It is submitted that the Incarnation makes nonsense of the idea that the Christian God is unconcerned with the world, and an understanding of the Spirit, (the one who is the promise that God's Kingdom will come, the one who points to the future) as involved in the being of Christ and in his being for us, helps to explain that the Incarnation was not an end but a beginning. We are freed by Christ's salvation in the Spirit to live an authentically human life, the life which Jesus of Nazareth lived out perfectly to its end in death so that we might understand that death is not final.

2g.Spirituality in the Church.

The emphasis on the freedom, in the Spirit, of the children of God, leads Congar to question , very gently, whether there might still be in the Church a spirit of 'security and rigidity' rather than a spirit of freedom. He draws attention to the abundance of collective gifts and resources which the Church has at her disposal

in the variety of the local churches and says that in this pluralism the Church must recognise the signs of the times. Now that the Church has faced up to the necessity of criticism of her own history, he feels that she must go beyond the middle-class, Western European model of expressing the Christian reality in order to bring the Gospel to the urban poor, in the developed and in the developing world, and to all racial groups. This will be considered further in a later chapter.
Another result of the growth of a Spirit approach to redemption and the way to holiness is a counter-balancing of the too-intellectual approach in the ascendant since the time of Descartes and inherent in the Scholastic method. The Spirit, as the bond of love and communion within the Trinity, is that, in God, which reminds us that we are people who live not just through our intellects but through our whole experiencing being . This opens us to new ways of prayer, new ways of experiencing God. In this connection the most important event must be the Charismatic Movement which will be considered in a separate section.
For Congar the Church is " the sign and at the same time the means of God's intervention in our world and our history." [Congar 1983,II, 6] In developing a pneumatological ecclesiology he sees the Spirit as the principle of the Church's identifying characteristics, the living principle of her saving sacraments but also as personally connected with and given to the individuals in the Church, re-shaping, re-creating them. The work of the Spirit in the church and the work of the Spirit in the lives of men though distinct, cannot be separated.

Conclusion.

Although he does not attempt a synthesis of all the material which he provides and the insights which he has, Congar's approach to theological anthropology and the Christian life can fairly be said to be pneumatological. His integration of the understanding of the Eastern Church helps towards an understanding of humanity as personal in the image of a relational God and therefore as structured in such a way as to be open to God's call. He also calls on Orthodox thinking, now more widely known and accepted in the West, to help explain that the possibility of this call and response is rooted in the way in which God is God. It is because of what Spirit is in the Godhead that it is fitting, we might even say inevitable if that did not risk impugning the freedom of the divine, that it is through His Spirit, in

Christ, that the Father communicates with His people.

Congar's discussion of the relationship of the individual to the indwelling Spirit makes a definite attempt to integrate the area of the Christian life with the doctrine of God as He is in Himself. Congar is careful to make sure that it is remembered that the Spirit points always towards Christ - the Word and the Spirit do God's work together and Pneumatology can never be separated from Christology - and by according to the Spirit a real role in the process of conversion and sanctification he opens up the way towards a mature spirituality and a clearer understanding of how the work of Christ is accomplished in us. Whereas the traditional Western approach to salvation manages without recourse to the Spirit who is not incorporated by Anselm for example, and works in terms of sanctifying grace which has no repercussions in experience, it is argued that Congar's insistence on the involvement of the Spirit and his movement away from a pure appropriation theory towards a more personal approach, allows for the possibility of a theological anthropology in which experience plays a greater part. It has been argued in Chapter Four that Congar has gone at least some way towards an incorporation of the Spirit in Christology andIwould now add that he has in his theological anthropology opened up a way forward for an understanding of the Spirit as a means of the interpretation of the individual and his place in history, at least within the community of faith. It must be said, however, that the fact that Congar is not really interested in the philosophical problems of bringing to belief is a defect in his theology. In mitigation it is suggested that perhaps too much is made of philosophy and rationality as the prime way human beings respond to God. The message that He is there and the witness to the reality in the lives of those who believe might in the last analysis be the more powerful weapon. If Christians really believe that the Kingdom is already in some sense present, their most important task is to provide the signs of its presence as grounds for the hope of its final coming. The result would be that the unbelieving would see God at work through His Spirit and be drawn to the living event. This is surely the something new which the Spirit brings, and to which much of the New Testament witnesses, and which was not present under the old dispensation, the living experience of sonship.

CHAPTER SIX
ECCLESIOLOGY

1. What Congar understood by 'Church'

2. The dialectic of 'institution' and 'community'

3.The Church as Communion

4.The Church made by the Spirit

5.The Results of a Communion Ecclesiology

CHAPTER SIX
ECCLESIOLOGY

1. What is meant by Church?

Congar's early thoughts emerge in an article, The Church and its Unity, originally written in 1937 [Congar 1965, 15-52] and in Divided Christendom, [Congar 1939.] He begins by looking to the Old Testament roots of the Church in the covenant which was first understood in an earthly sense, then later in a future sense, culminating in the expectation of an eternal kingdom, a new order of being, corresponding to the messianic era of God's reign over the entire world. Jesus preached an eschatological message ; that the messianic era had begun, the Kingdom of God had come and those who accepted the gospel and its demands, would receive salvation from God. Though His message was directed primarily to Israel, the salvation offered was offered to all, and since the message was rejected by Israel, God's plan of salvation had to be accomplished outwith it. This accomplishment takes place through the creation of a new covenant founded on the death and resurrection of Jesus. This death Jesus himself saw as instituting a new relationship, as atoning. However, the atoning death and its merits must be transmitted to those who respond to the 'come follow me' and this response must take place in time, in history. There is a historicity of salvation, and it takes place in what we call 'church'. So

> The Church is the fulfilment of the new covenant, the community of those who have been reconciled to God in Christ, dead and risen for us, and are called to live with God as his sons, citizens of the heavenly kingdom and to take partial possession of the inheritance of God. [Congar 1965,15]

The vision of the Church which Congar sets out in his early works is an impressive and liberating one. It is the very life of the Godhead offered and extended to humanity, the "extension of the divine life to a multitude of creatures." made possible through Jesus Christ.[Congar 1939,48.] Congar interprets the New Testament texts which speak of the mystery of the church as indicating that the Church is God's salvation present wholly in the single person of Christ and simultaneously in the multitude of His people, something

already present yet awaiting future consummation. This Church, this community is the result of the work of Christ in recapitulating all things in himself and is one. It is a unity essentially because it is the body of Christ. "It forms with him a single entity, a single beneficiary of the good things of God".[Congar 1965, 25]

Salvation now no longer means being a child of Israel but being " in Christ", part of his Mystical Body which Congar, in Divided Christendom equates with the Church.[Congar 1939,70] This Body of Christ is filled with the Spirit of Christ. Christ, having reconciled us with God by his Passion - Resurrection-Ascension, now, as life-giving Spirit fills creation with his presence. [Eph.4,10.] He is immanent in his Body by his Spirit. [Congar 1965,26.] Christians are 'in Christ Jesus,' i.e. in his body acting under his aegis, and Christ is in them as principle of their actions. In one sense this Body simply makes Christ visible and expresses him, a 'Christophany', but in another sense it is his fullness and adds achievement to him.(See Chapter 4 supra).

We have then, on the one hand the reality of God's self- revelation and salvation in Christ, and on the other the response of faith and love of the Christian by which he or she is drawn into Christ. These two aspects are understood as being brought into relationship with each other in the Church in what Congar calls the dialectic of gift and task; the Church is gift from above and also the effect of the co-operation of people, the Agape, a community exemplified by the first Christian generations, in which all helped one another freely in love. She is both Mystical Body, a community of those who share in the divine life of Christ, come from God above, and society of human beings leading a communal life organised according to certain laws governing worship, hierarchical offices and discipline, that is a church which is both institution and community. [Congar 1965,30.]

2.Institution and Community.

Congar is fascinated by the dual nature of the Church . She is both Ecclesia, assembly, the reality of the fellowship of men and women with God and with one another in Christ, and also the totality of the means of salvation, the means given by God to bring about that fellowship which is expressed in the word Ecclesia. [Congar (1957 &65) 1985, 28-30.] He sees all that might be called external in the Church, her very organisation and discipline, as having only one aim - "to unite souls to God by making them, through faith, the sacraments of faith, and love, loving members of the Mystical Body of Christ".[Congar 1965,52.]

Something of his understanding of what he means by "institution" and "community" emerges from his discussion of other traditions . Influenced by his ecumenical interests he is concerned with the different ways the denominations regard the Church. While he believes that the heart of ecclesiology is in the integration of the two elements , fellowship with God and means of grace, he thinks that many Protestant theologians have a dualist view which separates the 'Church', an invisible reality created by the action of God in the hearts of the faithful, and the churches, the visible human institutions. He refers to Schleiermacher's remark that the difference between Protestant and Catholic thought is that the former understands the tie binding the individual to the Church as being that individual's relationship with Christ while the latter makes the individual's relationship with Christ dependent on his relationship with the Church. [Congar (1950) 1968,397.] The Reformers, and the Reformed Tradition, desired so strongly to make it clear that the religious relationship, and therefore salvation, depended wholly on Christ, that they understand the Church as the action of the transcendent God working in the hearts of the faithful who then form the churches. In other words, only God, through His Spirit, forms the Church and the churches are visible realities of human making. [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985,30; (1950) 1968,411.] In Divided Christendom he expressed the opinion that in extreme Protestantism the benefits of the covenant are not deemed to exist in the Church seen as a human reality -

> the Church in her human and social form may proclaim and promise, may be, like John the Baptist, the call to and the finger pointing out Christ, but it is not the incarnation of the power of God, which, under forms connatural to mankind, expresses and effects , in their initial stages, the realities of the New Covenant and of the heritage of God. [Congar 1939,91.]

Such an approach, Congar believes, brings in its wake a misunderstanding of apostolicity and of the Church as institution. [Congar(1950)1968,397-8.] All Christian life and salvation is reduced to the action of Christ alone, communicating by his Spirit what he is. It follows from this that Christian life is not brought about by the Church, but that the Church is the result of the 'christianising' produced directly in souls by the Holy Spirit. What is sacrificed is the institutional Church, principle and means of salvation, while in Catholic tradition, Eastern and Western, the Church has always been understood as synthesis of spiritual reality and visible organisation. One must take account of the fact that though the Church is wholly dependent on Christ, he was an **incarnate** Christ, and all that structures the Church - the deposit of faith, the sacraments and the apostolic powers - comes from the work of the Son of Man. The Church so structured is the institutional Church which brings into being the Church as a community of people, i.e. there are two elements in or aspects of the Church-the community of the faithful and the institution, the latter in a certain sense anterior to the former.

2.a.The Institutional aspect .

The church is made up of the baptised. Yet she gives baptism; there is a sense in which she is made by her members and a sense in which she makes them and is anterior to them, and this in two ways .

Firstly, she is anterior to them because she exists before them in the plan of God, in divine pre-destination, and by virtue of the Incarnation, that is to say by virtue of the existence of the Church in Christ before any foundation of it by him ,

> In Christ...who as ...the Anointed One of God and in his three-fold capacity as king, priest and prophet, had in himself all the properties and energies by which the Church was to exist and to live; who throughout his life kept the Church in his thoughts and in his heart enabling her to exist and to live in him...Little by little Jesus actualised his purpose and the Church accordingly began to exist, no longer in God or in Christ, but in herself. [Congar(1957 & 65) 1985,30]

Thus we can speak of a reality of the church that is mystery, transcendent , anterior to her proper reality as congregatio fidelium. [Congar (1950) 1968 91-92.] Of course if one thinks in terms of this divine element as being what is really 'the Church', it is perfect, unchangeable and all that is wrong with what is seen as Church has to do only with the weakness and sinfulness of its members. As a result, and this is what happens in Vraie et Fausse Réforme , the positive contribution of humanity as history moves towards the time when God will be all in all, is underplayed. The same phenomenon can be expressed in terms of magnifying the Christological and minimising the Pneumatological in ecclesiology.

Secondly, for Congar, and Catholic ecclesiology in general, the institutional Church - that is the structural reality of the church, the deposit of faith, the sacraments and the exercise of apostolic authority - is in a sense prior to the faithful and the community which they form because these institutional aspects are the means of raising up and uniting the faithful, and it is these which bring about and shape the community of the church. The Christ-event, the epicentre of salvation history, has as its purpose to reconcile to God all creation, to bring back to him all that has its being from him. In Christ all is taken up, restored, reconciled. Congar equates the actualising of Jesus purpose, reconciliation of humanity with God, with the founding of the Church. [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985,30.] Jesus by the institution of the sacraments and the granting of priestly and authoritative powers to the apostles (all of which were made efficacious by his death) gave to the church its structure, its 'skeleton' (which, like the 'dry bones' of which Ezekiel speaks, had to be given life, in the case of the church by the Spirit at Pentecost.) In Divided Christendom, The Mystery of the Church and Lay People in the Church, but not in Vraie et Fausse Réforme, Congar understands the institutional aspect of the Church as means of grace, as having a provisional quality. In the latter, as T. I. MacDonald has noted, there is " a

certain narrowing of his vision of the Church " in that he places less emphasis on the eschatological dimension and when this happens the Church is seen as more static, a divine institution founded by Christ, eternal, unchangeable, its life restricted to meaning the sociological reality rather than the life of grace. [MacDonald 1984,79.]

Regarded as provisional, at the end of time when the Kingdom finally comes, the institution will be no longer necessary and will pass away, leaving the community which it has helped to bring about. It is to this, possibly provisional, structure or institution , not to the Church as community of the faithful, that Congar relates the hierarchy. The hierarchy is understood as perpetuating the work of Christ as his 'vicars', and as being the ultimate source of the sacramental activity on which the constitution and unity of the mystical body of the Church depends. The hierarchy, however, though important, is not the whole body.[Congar, 1965,30.]

This type of approach, based on the belief that the apostles, once the bodily presence of

Jesus Christ was no longer with them, formed a body through which he acts vicariously criticised by Protestant theologians. The basis of their criticism is that to hold such a view suggests that the apostles continued the mission of Christ as if they were in some way on the same level as he was. That is " It makes Christ appear to have said to his disciples 'when I go away you will take my place'....The Spirit is the true vicar of Christ." [G.S.Hendry, The Holy Spirit , London, 1957,65]

Those who think in this way fear that the Roman Catholic approach devalues the gospel, robs it of its singularity, by fusing with it or equating with it the teaching of the Church. While understanding this apprehension it has to be said that from within it seems clear that the Roman Catholic Church understands the apostolic work as mission and witness in the sense of John 20,21. and does not seek to usurp the unique work of Christ.

2.b.The Community aspect: the Church of the faithful.

Understood as such

> The Church is built together by the intercourse of its members one with another in a whole pattern of services of mutual enlightenment, ...by the habitual use, for the benefit of the body, of the gifts which

each has received: such a church cannot be called by any other name but 'community'. [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985,339.]

This second aspect of the Church is characterised by Congar as the 'life' pole, the living experience of the members as they relate to one another in a way which is dependent on their relationship with Christ. Christ is still at work in the world disseminating his grace. That is

> lived by men and in the 'doing' of men, Christ's grace comes to make the Church by another way besides that of the means dispensed by the apostolic ministry; it comes in the form of all sorts of gifts corresponding to men's 'living ' and 'doing'. [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985,328.]

This is the 'life' aspect of the Church, the principle of which is the Holy Spirit, sent by the glorified Christ, risen and seated at the right hand of God.
The importance of the Spirit is recognised here in that the Spirit is seen to have a role in making present the merits of Christ. Congar also understands Christ to have a relationship, in addition to that of founder, with his Church in that he quickens her by his Spirit. [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985,37.]
In a sense the existence of this 'life' dimension depends on the distinction but not the separation, of the missions of the Word and the Spirit. Congar certainly understands the mission of the Spirit as distinct, one which though closely connected with that of the Incarnate Word cannot be equated to it. [Congar 1965,107-8.] The restoration, the reconciliation with God which is the purpose of the Christ event must, to accomplish that purpose, be transmitted to all, in the here and now, the time of the Church, so that at the parousia God may be all in all. The reality of salvation is the saved. Christ's earthly activity left to humanity what has been referred to above as the institutional means of salvation - the deposit of faith, the sacraments and the hierarchical powers. That, however is not all. The Holy Spirit is sent, says Congar, to this body, not in the sense of an incarnation, but to be with it, in it, as a principle of life in an " inter-subjective ontology....a **being-with** which is an indwelling. " [Congar 1965,129..] This acceptance that the presence of the Spirit in the Church is not of an incarnational nature removes any suggestion that there is a sense of fusion in the doctrine of the Holy Spirit as the soul of the Church. The Spirit is not possessed by the Church. The Spirit is joined to

the Church by a union of covenant grounded in God's promise and plan. In her life aspect the Church is still being made and it would seem, that something is still being added to her being. There could thus be said to be an objective aspect, related to Christology, and a subjective or personal one which is the province of the Spirit and is connected with the personal spiritual life and salvation of the individual. This life aspect where the Spirit is particularly involved , is that where we see the Spirit at work in call, in conversion, in his own unpredictable impulses and especially in the charismata.

Congar, while making the distinction between the two aspects of the Church, community and institution, stresses that they are two aspects of the same reality - which must not be separated. (c.f. H. de Lubac's ecclesia congregans and ecclesia congregata.) In a sense, to devalue the institutional Church is to devalue the work of the **incarnate** Christ since all the structures of the visible Church, the deposit of faith, the sacraments and the apostolic powers, come from the work of the Son of Man. Catholic tradition does not separate the weak, the human, found in the 'Church from men', from the divine, infallible aspect which comes from God Himself because

> the transcendent, through the incarnate Word who entered history, brought into being his Body in which is continued the saving work of his redemptive Incarnation. [Congar (1950) 1968, 411.]

This union of the two aspects of the Church is very important in Congar's ecclesiology. He believes most strongly that the one Church is both institution and community, structure and life, and reminds us that this has been the teaching since the beginning of the Church. There is nothing in the texts, he says, to suggest a dissociation of the two though he is well aware that the ecclesiology of the treatises "de Ecclesia", in reaction to tendencies to reduce the Church to its inward aspect, concentrated on the institutional or structural aspect at the expense of that of life, reducing it to a kind of machine, a hierarchical mediation of the means of grace.[Congar (1957 & 65) 1985,45.] As a historical theologian he was concerned to restore the fullness of all that is meant by Church and to make comprehensible and meaningful, actual historical existence in time, and as a theologian interested in the Church in the world, faced with the pastoral problems of unbelief and of adaptation to modern aspirations to participation and autonomy, he was concerned to restore the community life of the Church to its proper place. Jerome Prunières says

that "Father Congar's intention is clear: he wanted to remove ecclesiology, reduced to a hierarchiology, from the cul-de-sac in which it was imprisoned." [Prunières 1966,254.]

T.I.MacDonald understands Congar's use of the dialectic between the hierarchical, juridical, institutional structure of the Church, and her communal life as a community quickened by the Spirit, as a foundational theme in his ecclesiology. For there to be a true dialectic the duality of structure and life must be reconciled in a unity without either aspect losing its authenticity. Does Congar succeed?

It seems that at certain stages, for example in Vraie et fausse réforme dans L'Église Congar gives priority to the divine, constitutive institutional elements in the Church which come from God Himself and cannot be corrupted. [ibid 100.] This at the expense of the Church as community because he is thinking of the community of the Church as a sociological reality, the People of God in their historical pilgrimage subject to the sinful conditions of this earth. [ibid 121.] The structure in this perspective is divine and infallible, incorruptible, never in need of reform, while in the life, the community, there is sin and therefore the need for reform of historical forms and of individuals in the Church. Elsewhere too, it seems at first that Congar subordinates the community to the institution. For example he indicates that he understands the institutional aspect of the Church as having primacy when in Lay People in the Church he says

> One-sidedness in the Gallican or Protestant sense touches the **structure** of the Church, it affects her in her very being, it involves an essential negation....one-sidedness in favour of the institution has never been anything but a matter of emphasis, touching the life of the Church; if it threatens anything it is not her being but her fullness. [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985,50.]

Again, in discussing the infallibility of the Church as community, what he calls at this point the 'loving and believing church', he makes clear that it is the institutional Church which has primacy in saying that the quality of being 'loving and believing church' " implies organic reference and submission to the magisterium."[Congar(1957 & 65) 1985, 291.] Likewise he sees the apostolic mission of the Church to be essentially perfect in the Apostles and any effective mission of the laity to have validity only from sharing in this, for

that of the laity is 'personal and spiritual', that of the hierarchy 'social and juridical. [ibid p.349-355] He is not in fact able to argue that here the two aspects of the Church, the institution and the community, are of equal importance. This is clear in a discussion of the work of Catholic Action for though

> Officially and actually, lay people are 'directors' or 'leaders'. They have a responsibility of their own, a certain autonomy, even a certain authority. Nevertheless in participating in the Church's apostolic mission they do not participate in hierarchical powers and Catholic Action remains subordinate to the hierarchy. Though 'directors' in a certain sense they clearly continue to be directed. [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985, 392.]

It is clear that there is a dualism in Congar's thinking. There is however, something of a difference in the way the relationship between structure and life, institution and community, is treated in Vraie et Fausse Réforme and the treatment in the other works to which I have referred. In the former we have a very rigid conception of the Church as divine creation and "The church is seen only in terms of its theandric qualities with emphasis on its unchanging elements." [MacDonald 1984, 84.]

Any development is restricted to the form of presentation and there is no conception of real integral growth. In his earlier works, Divided Christendom and The Mystery of the Church and also later in Lay People in the Church, there is a different emphasis. While the institutional aspect is still, I think, given priority it is as **means** to community, an aid to building up the fellowship of those who follow Christ. This changes the import. Life in these books is the Trinitarian life of God Himself given to humanity and expressed in the faith and love of the community of the faithful. This is what is central and although the institutional aspect of the Church is perceived to be essential, and indeed primary, what is most important of all is the eschatological reality, the time when God will be all in all and there will no longer be need of institutional means but only of community of grace. The time of the Church becomes the time in which Church and humanity work together towards the perfection of the eschatological reality . This development in Congar's understanding of the relationship between structure and life in the Church is connected with his development of a 'pleroma' Christology, used in "Lay

People in the Church" to ground an exposition of how the Church relates to history, to 'the world', and with the world, to the eschatological Kingdom. Though the focal point is Christological the church is set within the context of mankind sharing through Christ in the patrimony of God. It is seen as a mystical body, a new creation, which is already here but not yet in its perfection - the eschatological dimension ensures this and is not merely present as future, but also in the time of the Church giving it its inner meaning. Father Congar wants us to understand the Church as still in one sense being created through the communal principle, according importance therefore to each individual Christian. T. I. MacDonald refers to the criticism of Congar by Hendrik Kramer in A Theology of the Laity that because Congar, though introducing the communal principle, could not re-consider the hierarchical principle he provides a theology of the laity which is an appendix to a clerical ecclesiology. [MacDonald 1984,138.]

There is a sense in which this is true , that the Church is seen as a seamless web, hierarchical in her essence and in her fullness, because her being is substantially that of the institution and all else is either defined in relation to this, e.g. laity in terms of hierarchy, or is set over against it in a paradoxical system of assertions in which the Holy Spirit and grace are, and yet are not part of the Church. Either one ends up collapsing all into one, and that institution, or one works in rigidly dualist categories. Father Congar admits that in his essay on The Holy Spirit and the Apostolic College [Congar 1965,105-145] he so worked in dualist terms that he separated too abruptly a 'free sector' in which the Holy Spirit was at work, from the institutional Apostolic Church. [Congar 1983, II,11]

He also later criticised his presentation of laity in relation to clergy in Lay People in the Church as being too juridical and underestimating the work of the Spirit in the ecclesial community.[Congar 1971,17] It is however, true to say that the fact that he understands the primary importance of the community of grace in that it is this, not the institutional means, which will survive when all that is historical passes away, makes clear his growing desire to synthesise the two orders. This will become more successful as his pneumatology progresses for one can discuss this same problem of the relationship of community to institution also in terms of the Holy Spirit.

To understand the Spirit as simply animating an institution which has already been brought into being, is to reduce the Spirit to an accidental whereas the Christological aspect is constitutive. It seems that the Spirit's role is being

subordinated to that of Christ when it is said that it is the acts of Christ's passion which are the foundation stones of the Church, and the Spirit, the "other Paraclete" is "Christ's agent in his Church"; or again when "everything is already fulfilled in Christ; the Church is simply the manifestation of what is in him, the visible reality animated by his Spirit".[Congar 1965, 26 -27.] It must be said that here indeed the Christological is dominant ; though Congar is already very interested in bringing the Spirit into ecclesiology he is not doing so in a constitutively integrative way. The Christological aspect of the Church is also given prominence in Tradition and Traditions. Christ is seen as setting up a Church, a "structure of relationships" in the world, to be used by men, to be freely entered into so that they may be saved, that God may work out his plan for them. It is completed by the sending of the Spirit. [Congar 1966, 257-258.] However Congar in this work begins to move on from an understanding of the Spirit coming to the Church already constituted, giving to the Church already founded by Christ its vitality, its inner movement , to a more pneumatological understanding with the use of the concept of the Holy Spirit as the subject of tradition actively present in the Church.

It is this bringing of the Spirit into ecclesiology after its establishment with Christological material alone that is seen by the Orthodox Church to be a defect of Roman Catholic thinking on this subject. If the Holy Spirit is not strictly part of the Church, that Church finds its reality outwith the community of persons which makes it up, causing and determining that community by virtue of its, the Church's, being as a transcendent reality logically and metaphysically prior to it. [Prunières 1966,281.]

In bringing the Spirit into ecclesiology one must strike a balance between ecclesiological Nestorianism, in which the mysterious reality guided by the Spirit would be juxtaposed with the society of the Church but would have little impact on her visible history, and ecclesiological Monophysitism in which the idealised visible Church, a part of heaven on earth, loses contact with her actual historical existence.[Comblin 1989,84] The Christological and the Pneumatological must both be incorporated and in a balanced and nuanced way and this has long been Congar's intention.

While denying that Roman Catholic theology is as lacking in a pneumatological dimension as our Orthodox brethren suggest, Congar himself always tried to avoid Christomonism. In The Church and Pentecost where he attributed to Pentecost a Christological meaning, this was only to give value to what he saw as scripture's, especially John's, desire to connect the gift

of the Spirit with the passion of Christ .[John 7,38-39, 19,30 and 33-34.] He also makes clear that scripture points to the fact that the Holy Spirit and Christ do the same thing; constantly what is attributed to Christ's action is also attributed to the Holy Spirit, [Romans 8,9f.] He emphasises too that the Holy Spirit is not just the energy by which the glorified Christ acts in us. [Congar 1965,159.] Congar does not seem to see the work of Son and Spirit in connection with the founding of the Church even at this stage (1956) as being two different things. It is not a case of adding a Pneumatological aspect to the Church founded by Christ alone,

> the reality would seem to be that there is one single work but it has two phases of which the first is appropriated to the Incarnate Word, the second to the Holy Spirit. In the first, salvation is structured and made available; in the second life is infused into it, the form is set in motion and produces its living fruit.[Congar 1965,159-60.]

Analogously God formed Adam then breathed life, God delivered his people from Egypt then he sanctified them. As Christ redeemed us and established his mystical body, then committed to it life through the Spirit, so with the Church - Christ constituted it on earth, then gave it life at Pentecost. This does not yet avoid the accusation that the Spirit is not understood as being **constitutive** of the Church.

Later, however, in I Believe in the Holy Spirit [Congar, 1983] he makes clear that he understands the Church as being both of Christ and of the Spirit because he says that both in its life and in its origin, the church is the fruit of two divine 'missions'. "It is the fruitfulness outside God of the Trinitarian processions".[Congar 1983,II,7]

Congar believes that there would be agreement even from Protestant theologians that, at the very least, the pre-Paschal Jesus had in mind the bringing together of a group, a new People of God, bound together by his preaching of the Kingdom and his institution of the group of twelve Apostles as its leaders. There was then a Christological dimension which constituted the Church; he would add that the sacraments of Baptism and Eucharist which structure it came from the pre-paschal Jesus.

This rudimentary structure is, however, far from the Church portrayed in Acts. A new dimension has been added with Pentecost. The Spirit is the source of a new element in history.[Congar 1986, 78-79] The living Church is the Church

of Christ and of the Spirit. In this as in so many things balance is necessary. Too great an emphasis on the 'institutional' leads to rigidity. Equally too great an emphasis on the Spirit alone can cause problems of enthusiasm and individualism, and indeed a forgetting of the work of Christ 'in carne.'
It is for failing to integrate the Pentecostal dimension with the work of Christ on earth that Congar criticises Leonard Boff. Boff argued that what Jesus preached was not the Church but the eschatological Kingdom, saying that

> The Church as an institution was not based on the Incarnation of the Word but on faith in the power of the Apostles, inspired by the Holy Spirit who made them transfer eschatology to the time of the Church, and teaching about the Kingdom of God to teaching about the Church, an imperfect and temporal realisation of the Kingdom. [Congar 1986,79; Boff 1978,79-80,84]

While not entirely opposed to Boff's desire to open the way for new initiatives in the Church by understanding it as open to change in form as circumstances dictate, for he accepts that the Spirit made the Church through the Apostles, and that the mission of the Church quickened by the same Spirit may call for new forms, Congar feels that the necessary balance is threatened by Boff's approach. The Kingdom which Jesus proclaimed was not simply eschatological; " it incorporates the vision that it would to some extent be accomplished here on earth, after Jesus' death, in a community resulting from him and the Twelve." [Congar 1986, 79.]
In addition, however, the Spirit, part of the Church from her very foundation, ensures that the vivifying quality of the transcendent cause is intrinsically woven into her being, able to bring her back to her Source; the same Spirit is, at the same time, in every individual believer. This new spiritual, element is the source of the dynamism to be found in the community life of the Church, manifested for example in the charisms, which helps to build the Mystical Body and contributes to its fullness. Congar stresses, however, that the Spirit does the work of Christ, builds up the Body of Christ and finally leads back to the Father from whom all originated, i.e." A sound pneumatology always points to the work of Christ and the Word of God". [Congar 1983,II,12.]
It is submitted that with his increasing emphasis on the Holy Spirit Congar provides for a more dynamic perspective and one which allows for a greater emphasis on the role of the community of the faithful in the Church. This

approach flowers in the doctrine of the Church as 'communio.'

3.The Church as Communion

On the eve of the Second Vatican Council the ecclesiology which was dominant in the Roman Catholic Church was that which understood the church as a society, a perfect society. At its most extreme, for example in Billot's Tractatus de Ecclesiae Christi, of 1898, this approach led to a consideration of the body of the Church as conceptually separate from its soul, grace, a body existing independently of the graces and virtues found in its members.[Congar 1984b,9] Such an approach can lead to the Church being defined primarily in terms of structures, as institution. This aspect is of course necessary. Problems arise when it is understood as the whole of ecclesiology. Whereas the Patristic period and the early Middle Ages were relatively free of institutionalism, it developed in the late Middle Ages, hardened in the Counter Reformation period and reached its apogee in the latter half of the nineteenth century at the First Vatican Council with the first draft of the Dogmatic Constitution on the 'Church of Christ' .(Since this draft was never submitted to the vote of the Council Fathers it is not as official teaching of the Church. It does, however, represent the mind of the Church at that time, as can be seen from its conformity with later papal pronouncements.)

The same document stressed the fact that this institutional Church is an unequal hierarchical society, an idea already found with Pope Gregory XVI, in which not only are there clerics and lay people, but more importantly that the power of jurisdiction of the hierarchy is absolute and coercive.

This approach, says Congar, became fundamental to official ecclesiology between the First and Second Vatican Councils. The manuals set out to prove that Christ in his earthly ministry founded the Church as a society, - Christ is founder rather than foundation - perfect, complete, with all necessary powers of legislation, government and punishment, a hierarchical society founded on the Roman Pontiff, a "veritable spiritual monarchy." [Congar 1984b, 12- 14.]

Such an approach, whatever gains it might bring in stability and a strong sense of corporate identity, leads to legalism and a non-involved laity, and is inimical to any kind of theological freedom or creativity. Father Congar notes that until the Second Vatican Council it had never been said clearly and officially that the Church is forever in need of reform, because only then was there a good enough understanding of the difference between the Church of

the Kingdom and her historical manifestation. He himself had cause to know that a triumphant apologetic reigned supreme.[Congar 1984b,20.]

The Second Vatican Council brought about a profound change in approach as it moved away from a narrow societal model of the Church to one which understood it as mystery, as sacrament, as Body of Christ, as People of God. While the institutional aspect remained, for the document on the Church, Lumen Gentium retains elements of a juridical ecclesiology (n.8, n.14, n.20) it was set in a wider context.

In it the Council began to erode the 'christomonistic' approach to ecclesiology by indicating in n.14. that the definition of the Church must include the fact of her 'having the Spirit of Christ' and in 3,8. stating that the institutional Church is " at the service of the Spirit of Christ who gives life to build up the body." There is added to the concept of the institutional church that of the church as 'mystery' - the transcendental reality manifested by the visible reality - and Lumen Gentium describes it as a mystery of 'communion'. We are called by God to share in his divine life.(I,1,4) This communion is realised in a unique way in Jesus Christ and what took place once and for all in him is continued by the Holy Spirit in the church and in individuals. Thus in the Spirit we come, through the work of Christ, to the Father and share in his life, characteristic of which, is the principal of communion which must therefore be the principal by which the church also lives. [I,5.]

Walter Kasper has said that the idea of the Church as "communio" is one of the leading, if not the leading, idea of Vatican II. Both the Bible and ancient philosophy, he says, understood that fellowship or communion was a fundamental human longing, and it is even more necessary to-day when it is evident that individualism has failed to bring fulfilment to humanity. Together with the biblical and patristic revival in the early part of this century there was also a growing dissatisfaction with rigid institutionalism of the Church which led to a longing for an ideal of fellowship so that Guardini could write of "the church awakening in the hearts of men." [Kasper, 1989,149]

Yves Congar was one of those to whom the re-discovery of the concept of the Church as a communion is to be attributed, and his work, with that of others, laid the foundation for the ecclesiology of Vatican II. He tells us that Paul VI loved the concept of 'communion' [Congar 1984b,17.] In the context of understanding the Church as 'mystery', depending on the work of Christ understood as a real engagement of the Trinitarian God with the world, the concept of 'communion' is particularly apt. It is derived from 'koinonia', 'community,' sharing a common interest, but has a vertical as well as a horizontal dimension; the participation of the Christian in Christ and in the Spirit is the vertical dimension from which flows the visible unitive relationship. [Congar1978,84.] For Congar, the first pillar on which the notion of the Church as a communion rests is the Trinity itself, understood as a community of persons mutually present to one another and sharing and communicating to one another " life and fecundity in knowledge and love." [Congar 1939,52.] The Church can be traced to its origin in the community of the Trinity itself; she is 'Ecclesia de Trinitate' "a community of souls living the very life which is the life of the Blessed Trinity because the object of their lives is the same as that of the life of God Himself."[Congar 1939 ,58.]

It is God's plan, His desire, to communicate His life to His creatures, from the One to the Many, " so that they actually share the life and participate in the purposes of God."[ibid p.48.] Congar magnificently characterises the Church in which this plan is realised as "a communion of many persons in the same divine life...a society of spiritualized beings, a community of human persons with divine Persons."[Congar 1939,48]

The Church is, therefore, an echo of the Trinity in which the Persons are perfectly present to one another. His vision of the Church as a reflection of Trinitarian life provides, therefore, a possible foundation for the concept of " communion".

The Holy Spirit also is foundational to the concept of 'communio'. It is fitting that this should be so, that the Spirit should be seen as bringing about this union of human persons with divine Persons, a union in which there is no question of the freedom of any person being impugned; the Spirit is God present , like Wisdom permeating the world, penetrating all things (Wis. 7,22-23) furthering God's plan, ushering in the time when he will be 'everything to everyone' (1 Cor.15,28) because he is the eschatological gift.(Congar 1983,II,17) The Spirit is the one who brings about the fulfilment of God's design which is communion i.e. uniplurality, the life of the One

communicated to the many.

T.I.MacDonald holds however, that Congar does not fully develop his insights concerning communion because he is tied also to a monarchical view of God as the One over the many. [MacDonald 1984,213] It has to be said that Congar also denounces the pre-trinitarian, almost monotheistic view of God which leads to such a monarchical approach with the accompanying ecclesiology of 'all for the people, nothing by the people'.[Congar 1974,308.] MacDonald feels however that he 'waffles' between the two views.

What is true is that Congar does not envisage the model of 'communion' being the only one by which to represent the Church. In this he is correct for to do so would be to substitute one lop-sided approach for another. There is , he says a Christian ontology with a sacramental basis, but this needs to be made more specific by law, i.e. the Church is a communion but since it must have a social form, this is implemented by rules.[Lauret 1988,33.]

This is a reversal of the order of the institutional approach. As long as one begins with the primary concept of 'communion' there is no harm it is advanced, in acknowledging that there is a societal aspect of the Church. What one must remember, and Congar makes this clear, is that " the way into ecclesiology is not through society but through communion." [Lauret 1988,43.]

Congar is, as one immersed in and devoted to the Tradition of the Church, conscious of the fact that one cannot simply jettison the ecclesiology of the last thousand years. What he envisages is a synthesis of the old with the new, or rather the re-discovered. This can only come about with a great deal of work and reflection on the meaning of 'communion' and, as the years since the Council have shown, this has not been without difficulty as the existential problems of the relationship between the Pope and the college of Bishops, of the position of Bishop's conferences and of pluralism in the Church have shown.

4. The Church made by the Spirit.

If the doctrine of the Church as Communion rests, in the first place on the Trinity of God, it rests in the second place, on pneumatology and Congar's mature theology firmly insists that the Holy Spirit 'co-institutes' the Church. It is submitted that a Church which is seen as a 'continued incarnation' of Christ would be a Church which could not change, static, uninvolved with history. A Church understood as also made by the Spirit would in contrast be an evolving Church, however that might be interpreted. An ecclesiology of communion is therefore, linked with a pneumatological ecclesiology, indeed must give a place to pneumatology because in it the Church is understood as a community of persons, who each having received the Spirit, work together to build up the Church to help it evolve. It involves moving away from the view that Jesus, once and for all, instituted a hierarchical, sacramental Church, which, like a clock once wound up continuing to function on its own, could go on working no longer in need of any intervention from God, to a vision of a People open to and in a sense driven by, the presence and action of the Holy Spirit.
Congar looks at all facets of the one, holy catholic and apostolic Church, and finds, as the unifying sub-structure of these 'marks' of the Church, the Holy Spirit working within the communion he has helped bring about.

4.a The Church is One

The Trinitarian vision of the presentation in Divided Christendom is a splendid repudiation of the idea of the Church as simply a society of men. It is "the divine Societas itself, the life the Godhead reaching out to humanity and taking up humanity into itself". [Congar 1939, 48-49.] Here the unity of the Church is seen as founded first and foremost on the trinitarian unity of God and the continuation of His very life. It may be said in passing that the fact that this understanding comes in the course of an exploration of the divisions within the one Church of God only goes to intensify the pain of division. It points to the necessity of probing the relationship of the Church visible with her inner nature to see how the unity of God who is also Trinity can be reflected in an actual unity of those who are Christians. The unity remains whatever men do.
In L'Église Une Sainte Catholique et Apostolique, also, Congar's theology

places the unity of the Church in relation to the God who is One. Within the Church are the means which, ideally, will be used to lead to the salvific unity of humanity in the eschatological time when God will be possessed by each and by all The unity of the salvation and that of the means are joined in Christ who is both source and mediator of unity, and central to it is faith in him and participation in the sacraments.[Congar 1970a,13-18]

4.a1 The unity of the Church is Pneumatological.

The function of the Spirit is understood when it is remembered that in His plan for our salvation God works with and through the incarnate Christ **and** the Holy Spirit. Salvation originates in the passion and death of Christ but becomes effective through the Spirit. [Congar 1970a,28.] This can be expressed in terms of love, love as end, love as means, love drawing together those who share the same destiny.[Congar 1970a,39.]
It is fitting that the Spirit is the one who brings about the participation of human beings in the love with which God loves Himself since the Spirit is Love in a special way.[Congar 1970a,40.]
When the Spirit was promised to the Apostles it was with the whole People of God in mind, and significantly the Spirit came upon the community gathered together - epi to auto - and of one mind - homothumadon. This was the initial unity which the coming of the Spirit, the principal of unity, pre-supposed, and which was itself the work of God. " Ubi Caritas et Amor Deus Ibi Est."
Congar believes this to be of decisive importance because

> if the Spirit is received when believers are *together*, it is not because there is only one body that there is only one Spirit - it is rather that because there is only one Spirit of Christ that there is only one body which is the body of Christ.
> [Congar 1983,II,15.]

The Spirit has acted in bringing men together in love, quietly bringing about consent to be together, to enable them to become that body and he is then given to the body and to individuals in it. This confirms that Congar sees the Spirit as constitutive of the Church.
The Spirit is given to the community and to the individual persons in that community. Given, it should be said, not in the sense of a possession, but as

an enablement, so that something can be done. The personhoods of the individuals are harmonised in the communion as the Spirit brings about the reconciliation of the many in the one and it is done without infringing the freedom of the individual. Unity therefore cannot mean uniformity. The modern excessive emphasis on authority in the Church has led to a distrust of the personal principle, the fact that the Spirit is given to individuals and it is they who are the wealth of the Church. Persons want to be subjects of their own actions. The fact that people to-day choose a personally accepted faith leads to diversity and it is the Spirit who brings unity out of this. Oneness therefore is not something imposed from above, but an outgrowth from the presence of the Spirit in the many.

All discussion of "Church" in Congar's theology takes place within the context of God's plan of salvation. The time of the Church is the time between that of Christ's work of redemption and that of his second coming at the Parousia; (it is within the parallel time of history). All three 'times' must be in some essential way united if the totality is to be comprehensible and reasonable. Congar has, as noted supra Chapter 4, used the concept of Christ as Alpha and Omega to unify the 'times' .The concept of the Spirit can it is submitted, be seen as a further unifying principle bringing together the incarnate Christ, his people in the Church, and his kingdom finally come. Indeed in Lay People in the Church the coming of the Kingdom, the result of the exercise of Christ's royal power, is spoken of in terms of " the perfect dominance of the higher principle of the Pneuma, the gift that belongs to the messianic era." [Congar (1957 & 65)1985,59-60.] Mühlen makes the same point through an understanding of the Spirit as the One who is present in Christ, in the Church and in the individual. Thus he understands the same Spirit who is the inner-Trinitarian "We" to be in both Christ and Christians.[Mühlen 1969]

Congar sees the communion of saints, the 'koinonia' of the church, as being a reality which transcends time and space and this because it is brought about by the Spirit and according to what the Spirit is in essence, the bearer of God's powerful free activity. The Spirit , who by being the Spirit of prophecy points forward, the Spirit who is above all eschatological gift, brings the new time of salvation into history. As yet only present as the 'earnest' of the Kingdom he, as 'co- instituting' principle of the Church, unites the here and now with the time to come. It is not enough in theology to make abstract statements about what the Spirit does without relating them to what the Spirit is in himself. Congar is careful to relate the role of the Spirit to what is revealed in Scripture

and made known through the experience of the Church and the reflections of theologians through the ages. Thus because the Spirit is " transcendent and inside all things, subtle and sovereign, able to respect freedom and inspire it " that Spirit can further the 'communion' which will be perfect when God will be "everything to everyone" (1 Cor.15,28.) can help to bring about the ideal of one animating many without absorbing any.[Congar 1983, II,17.] He also takes up the concept of "anamnesis", the special kind of remembering which brings into reality that which is remembered, using the idea of the Spirit as 'memory' to link past with future and present. So

> 'The Spirit is anticipation (Arrha), prophecy, John 26, 13 and also memory. As memory he makes the actions and words of the Word made flesh into a present and penetrating reality, John 14, 26 and 16, 13-15. In the church then he is the principal of that presence of the past and the eschatological future in the here and now, of what can be called the 'sacramental era'.[Congar 1983, II,18.]

4.a 2 Existential Implications

Congar sees as an important innovation of Vatican II, the introduction of the eschatological point of view and so of historicity, something which was seriously lacking, a shortcoming linked with the juridical view of the church. Vatican II sees the Holy Spirit, present in the evolution of human communities, as presiding over time, renewing the face of the earth. Disciples of Christ led by the Spirit are engaged in a historicity which has as its goal the Kingdom of the Father. All this is important existentially. The vision of the Church which does not see simply a completed historic institution, ministering salvation, but an open living communion in which things still happen, in which there are events, interventions, 'New Pentecosts', is one which respects the freedom of the individual. Congar is conscious of this and speaks of the necessity, and difficulty, of forming mature Christians whose religion is not born of legalism or fear but of a vital faith in the living God. [Congar 1959,39-44.] To have mature Christians one needs a mature clergy willing to enter into dialogue with the laity and to accept the risk of non-conformity. It is no longer enough to say " Rome has spoken - the cause is finished."

The notion of oneness must be understood within the communion of a

believing community. It is not however, a community so sublime that it is pure ideal divorced from everyday life. Within a real community unity makes both theological and spiritual sense. In the latter sense it should be the source of real fruits of love and generosity, working against the individualism which is so much a part of modern secular life and which is also a possible danger in the type of Catholic spirituality which focuses on the relationship between individual and God and the personal sanctification of that individual to the exclusion of the turning towards the other which is at the heart of the Trinity and which would, it is submitted, with an emphasis on Congar's approach, become more a part of church life.

Congar himself believes that the ideal of mystical communion in the Spirit must be transferred to, and have meaning in, everyday life. He quotes the study of Jean Séguy in the United States which found that the Roman Catholic Church in America, from being the least segregationist Church in the nineteenth century, now has few black members. Séguy finds the reason for this in the fact that though there is communion at the level of faith and practice in the Catholic church in America there is no trace of what Congar calls "effective and concrete human communion".[Congar 1983, II,20,21.] Black and white people take communion together in Church but otherwise go their separate ways. There is no evidence of what could be called 'parish family.' One does not have to go to the United States to see this. Congar does refer to some more positive statements he has heard but there is, it is submitted, much more to be done in this area; the linking of social practice with ecclesiological principle will give a sounder foundation for the progress which is being attempted. Whether there has been much progress towards a real understanding of this aspect of church - communion - in the last 30 years is problematical. There still seems to be a desire of the Institutional church to see unity as conformity which, when taken together with a growth of human desire for community in place of individualism rampant in society, leaves a gap which, if not filled by the church, will be filled by less desirable alternatives. Since Aristotle it as been held that the human being living the moral life can only find its perfection in community. Plato bases this on the fact that the individual needs the co-operation of others, a position taken up nearer our own time by Durkheim, and found at the root of Lord Devlin's view that a shared moral code is one of the cohesive factors in society.[Devlin 1965.] Such an approach is no longer in the ascendant. The ideology of capitalism, the prevailing world socio-economic system, is liberal

individualism which leads in many cases to the interpretation of 'interest' as 'self-interest' and undermines the community nature of authentic human existence. It is for the Church to point to the true way forward and to make sure that true community is evident in her life, not by withdrawing into herself but by opening herself to all in love i.e. in the Spirit. This means respecting the other, his or her freedom and personality; as Congar points out, loving as **God** loves does not constrain the other,(Sartre) but means loving in a way that understands the other as a growing and developing person so as to encourage and enable that other to be authentically him or herself.[Congar,1969,178]

As for the presence of pluralistic views in the Church, differences should not lead to division. Is it not better, for example, that theologians who wish to explore new paths should do so within the community, and with the blessing of the Church, rather than feel that they must leave because of an unloving centralism? Congar has been commended by Ratzinger for doing just that, remaining patiently within the Church when his views were being criticised.[Ratzinger 1986,317] It is because the Church is "a unity in communion, a unity in reconciled difference" that she is the universal sacrament of salvation. [Kasper 1989,164.]

4b. The Catholicity of the Church.

One cannot, Congar believes, speak of the unity of the Church without mentioning its catholicity. [Congar 1983, II,24.] This is so because it is " the law which governs the relation of what is diverse and multiple to unity." [Congar 1939,93.] Catholicity is the whole, the one, towards which the unity of the many is directed. It is the universal capacity for unity, i.e. the capacity of the Church to win all humanity to salvation. [Congar 1965, 98.]

There have in fact been many controversies over the meaning of Catholicity. Scripture does not point to a definitive meaning. New Testament scholars do not attribute to Christ the preaching of a universal message of salvation and Paul and the writer of Acts do not refer to any such direction. In Congar's view "it was in course of actually becoming universal that the Church became aware of its universality." [Congar 1965,100.]

The first application of the word 'catholic' to the church is found in 110 when Ignatius of Antioch writes " Where the Bishop is there is the community, just as where Jesus is there is the Catholic Church."

This has been interpreted in western theology as contrasting the local church round its bishop with the 'catholic', that is the universal, church. The text however, does not suggest that Ignatius himself meant this but rather that his vision of the church was that of Christ and the Church being present in the local community round the Bishop. Congar takes from Ignatius of Antioch both that where there is no Bishop there is no Church, and a close linking of the heavenly and earthly church; the Bishop, the earthly head, is linked with Jesus the divine head, so giving 'catholic' a connotation of authenticity.[Congar 1970a] He also thinks it denotes universality, saying that in Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian and the Muratorian Canon 'catholic' has this note of authenticity , and that from the third century it means the true church across the world or a local church in communion with it.[ibid] Zizioulas on the other hand, says that it is probably not until the fourth century, out of the struggle of Optatus of Milevis and Augustine against the provincialism of the Donatists, that the term 'catholic' came to be identified with 'universal'.[Zizioulas 1965,144,n.3.]

Cyril of Jerusalem gives the most detailed meaning of 'catholic' to be found in early Christianity. The Church is catholic because it extends throughout the whole world, teaches all that one needs for salvation, brings all into a unity of right worship, heals all sin and possesses all conceivable virtues.[Catechesis

XVIII.]

However, with first the Great Schism and then the Reformation the fairly general acceptance of what catholicity meant underwent a change and different groups interpreted it differently; so to- day, for example, the Orthodox claim it for themselves and interpret it as the embodiment of the authentic Patristic legacy celebrated in the liturgy [Lossky 1974.] whereas many Catholics still think of it in terms of unity under Rome combined with world-wide extension.

In L'Eglise Une, Sainte, Catholique et Apostolique Congar finds the root of the catholicity of the Church in her Trinitarian origin. The Father wills universal salvation, worked out in time, and wills also the means of that salvation in Christ, mediator and Lord, and in the Church which is the universal sacrament of that salvation. The return to oneness and wholeness of all creation is from the Father, through the Son, in the Spirit. In Divided Christendom, where the catholicity of the Church is described as " the dynamic universality of her unity, the capacity of her principle of unity to assimilate, fulfil and raise to God, in oneness with Him, all men" Congar says it is Trinitarian and Christological in its foundation because it expresses the relationship that exists between the one God and the multiplicity of His creatures, a relationship established in Christ. [Congar 1939,94-95.] Christ is, therefore, the pivot of this process, the foundation of its universality. He has, though his mission was in one sense to a particular time and place, a universal dimension as " the light of the world and Lord of all." [1983,II,24.] The Church receives this universal dimension from Christ her Head who works towards restoring all people, indeed all creation, to unity in the Father.

There are two aspects to catholicity understood in this way as coming from Christ; there is continuity between Christ and the Church firstly in that she is formed institutionally by what comes from him, and secondly there is the continuity which comes about by the communication of his Spirit, i.e. there is the particularity of Word, Sacraments and Ministry, and also the dynamic presence of the Spirit.

4.b1 The holy Spirit is the principle of Catholicity.

Although the Holy Spirit does not as yet bring about the total transformation which will result in God being all in all, he is actively at work, making "the Church catholic, both in space, that is, in the world, and in time, that is in

history."[Congar 1983, II,24.]

What Congar means by the mission of the Spirit in space is the role of the Spirit in the spread of Christianity throughout the world. This was begun with his establishing the church at Pentecost and at that time giving her a vocation to universality. Congar founds this on Acts 2,6-11. which he takes literally; the Church was seen to be opened up to all the world by her particular message being miraculously extended to the nations as each heard the message in his own language.[Congar 1983,II,25-26.] Even if we interpret this text differently, as a manifestation of the miracle of tongues heralding the communication of the gospel message rather than as different languages, we can still accept that there was an intervention of the Spirit for there can be no doubt of the volte-face of the post-Pentecostal Church, her turning outwards towards the diaspora, the gentiles and a plethora of cultures.

Congar's point in making the Spirit thus the principle of catholicity is that the universality of the Church comes from the extension of the one gospel message, the one faith, to different places, not by rigid imposition of unity but by the incorporation of gifts found in the different places and people. It is from such an approach, we shall see, that there comes the notion of the Church as a communion of local Churches and a recognition of the value of particular charisms for the being of the Church.

Congar also speaks of the Spirit making the Church present in history. He is thinking of the Spirit as making present, through the Church, for each generation, the mystery of Christ, and sees this happening in Scripture and Tradition.[Congar 1983, II, 29]Whereas in the past Catholic theologians have interpreted the role of the Spirit in maintaining the authenticity of the Church's teaching simply in terms of his guaranteeing the acts of the magisterium, Congar sees it also in terms of the Spirit "making knowledge present in continuity with what has gone before".[Congar 1983,II,29.] The Spirit helps the whole Christian community to have a universal and unerring sense of faith which manifests itself when the whole body of the faithful shows universal agreement in matters of faith and morals. This is set out in Lumen Gentium as a sharing by the People of God in Christ's prophetic office through faith and sustained by the Spirit of truth. (L.G.12,1) When Congar discussed the sharing of the church in Christ's prophetic function in Lay People in the Church he set it in a too rigid context of the church as divided into institution for salvation and community of the faithful, with the hierarchical ministry belonging to the structural element. [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985,271f.] For instance he mentions

that it was lay people, indeed women, who first came to the empty tomb but dismisses their witness as being "without properly ecclesial weight, without structural value for that apostolic witness on which faith is to be based " [ibid 281.] This witness belongs to "the order of personal fervour" indicating that he has a sense of a difference in the levels and ways at which different people work in the church. So "Actions of life are for all, but for some only is their activity constructional in the church contributing to her solidity and government".[Congar 1957 & 65) 1985, 281.]

Certainly he also says that the simultaneous affirmation and organic combination of the two aspects (institution of salvation and community of the faithful) are " the keynote of a catholic ecclesiology" [ibid p.275] but the implication is of the superiority of the hierarchy, of a teaching church and a taught church.

While in his later work he continues to hold that there are two aspects to the Church, a dual pattern of institution coming from the earthly work of the incarnate Word, and present activity of the glorified Lord 'who is Spirit', he no longer does so in terms of structure and life, responding to the criticism this approach received.[Congar 1986, 81.] As a result of this development and of the greater emphasis on the role of the Spirit he is able to think of the catholicity of the Church, her authenticity, being in the magisterium not as an isolated concept, apart from and over the people, but understood within the community of the Church. In addition he is able to give a higher profile to the initiatives of the Spirit in individuals which allow them to express their talents and re-shape the Church. [Congar 1986, 81-82.]

4.b2 Existential Implications.

The aspect of universality, of catholicity, raises interesting existential questions. What happens when the Church comes into contact with different peoples, different cultures? How do you integrate the new, the strange while still being true to the received? What is meant by the local church and what of her relationship with the centre?

Ecumenism and Mission.

Congar is interested in the relations between the Churches and is very conscious of the importance of diversity and of the need to give value to the "other" without losing one's own self- identity. This applies both in relation to ecumenism and also in connection with the introduction of Christianity, here in its Roman Catholic form, to non-European areas. In the ecumenical field there has been much progress between the Churches in the sense of understanding one another's position, progress with which Congar was associated from the beginning. No one Church has, however, succeeded in convincing the others that hers is the fullness of truth. Congar, writing in 1982, was not prepared to give up because of this and leave the possibility of unity to eschatology. [Congar 1982,163]

Again in conversation with Bernard Lauret, he says that he " would want to protest against a certain ecclesiological defeatism." [Lauret,1988, 80] The fact that there is difficulty, and often seems to be little progress is a result of our paradoxical condition of being "already and not yet" in the Kingdom. Lumen Gentium15, speaks of there being genuine union in the Holy Spirit. Giving up the search for ecclesial re-union is not an option.

The concept of unity in diversity may offer a way forward. Here Congar sees the fundamental ecumenical problem to be that of specifying " what diversities would be compatible with the establishment of full communion." [Congar 1984a, 109.] In effect he is not asking that the Churches should accept all that Rome decrees, but that, in the context of there being some truths which are more important than others, it should be possible for there to be a 'unity in diversity' where people hold and express the same belief though they may express it differently, possibly making use of the concept of a 'hierarchy of truths'. [Henn1987,158-159,191 passim]

There are truths of faith but they exist in a hierarchical order according to

their relationship with the central truth or foundation of the Christianity expressed when believers confess their faith in " God one in three", and in " the incarnate Son of God , our Redeemer and Lord." [Congar 1984, 12.] From the point of view that truth is an absolute, there cannot be degrees of truth, but truth is truth about something , i.e. it has an objective content. From this perspective truths can be ordered according to their closeness to the focal point of revelation and faith. [Congar 1984, 130.] In addition, truth is perceived by a subject, conditioned and limited by history and the historical forms of the dogmatic statements of the Christian Churches gives us another form of hierarchy of truths. [ibid.] Congar does not say which historical dogmas are to be considered most important, but" given that the axis of Christian faith is assured, one can accept various expressions of it. The formula seems ideal; the problems arise when it is put into practice."[Congar 1984, 92.]

This sentiment could well apply to the relations between the Roman Catholic and Orthodox Churches especially in relation to the Filioque controversy. Here there is an instance of two acceptable and complementary expressions of the same truth which nevertheless are a source of discord. The case may be different if diversity is deemed to be the expression of error. Thus the difficulties with the Orthodox over the Roman Primacy and Infallibility might be more intractable. Congar does not really discuss this though he does say that some errors are more damaging to communion that others, suggesting that some mistaken beliefs may be compatible with communion. His attention to the problem of unity in diversity focuses attention on the question of belief in what truth is necessary for communion. It may be said that the attitude of Congar in Diversity and Communion shows a development from that in his early ecumenical work Divided Christendom. Jossua says that while the former could be understood as using an approach which could still be called 'Catholic dogmatism', the latter is empirical, open and questioning.[Jossua 1982 pp.342-355] It is interesting and, it is submitted, significant, that there should be this shift at the time when his specifically pneumatological work is at its height.

There is also the question of how the Roman Catholic Church should carry out her mission to the non-Western and non-Christian world. The Conciliar document Ad Gentes was criticised for having too strong a " missionary " flavour and being influenced by the attitude which understood 'mission' in terms of taking cuttings from the European parent Church and transplanting

them in other soil. [Congar 1980,172.] The imperial attitude of imposing one's religion on others has to a large extent disappeared, witness the dropping of the term 'missionary' by religious orders because of its pejorative overtones, and the movement of 'inculturation' which is

> the integration of the Christian experience of a local Church into the culture of its people in such a way that this experience not only expresses itself in elements of this culture but becomes a force that animates , orients and innovates the culture so as to create a new unity and community not only within the culture in question but also as an enrichment of the Church universal. [Roest-Crollius 1978,735]

There is a body of opinion which questions whether 'mission' is possible at all among indigenous peoples, in Latin America, for example. Though critics suggest that the Roman Catholic Church cannot convert without domination, without denying indigenous cultures, it is possible through the Spirit. Only the Spirit can enable people to create their own churches and form communities on the basis of equality but without Western traditions and Western laws. Theologians in Latin America do not, however, perceive this to be happening.[Comblin 1989,98-99]

That we can look at these problems of ecumenism and mission more objectively to-day than in the past is connected with the wider understanding of, perhaps rather a re- centring on, the function of the Holy Spirit as the presence of God still working with His people; connected also with the decline of the use of only one model for understanding the Church, that of institution. There is a recognition that the Spirit is at work in all peoples, everywhere, at all times.

Local and particular churches.

When we consider the Church as 'communion' we are thinking primarily not of the institutional form but of the aspect of 'mystery', of the Church as bearer of the divine life in which it is the will of God that we share. Walter Kasper says that this participation, this sharing in the salvation given by God through the Son and the Spirit, is the original meaning of 'communio'.[Kasper 1993,232-244.] When Unitatis Redintegratio [2,6] says that the supreme model and origin of the mystery of the Church "is in the Trinity of Persons, the unity of One God, Father Son and Holy Spirit" (perhaps the influence of Congar contributed to this) it is clear that the Council is thinking of the Church understood as a communion of persons, and also, we shall see, as a communion of local churches.

The Church considered as a 'communio sanctorum' has to be brought into being in history, and this can be understood to happen, at any particular time, in the local church or community rather that in the Church perceived as a universal entity. In other words, the whole adventure of 'Church' finds its meaning in its coming to birth in the 'event' of the people gathered together to meet with Christ in the celebration of his salvific work. All that is Church is realised in the local church or Eucharistic community or, as Congar puts it," The local Church is the Church of God in a particular place." [Congar 1983,II,26.]

It was as this realisation of the One, Holy, Catholic and Apostolic Church that the Second Vatican Council understood the local Church. (L.G.26,1, U.R. 2,2 & 6) and Rahner thought that this was the most valuable new element introduced by the Council. [Rahner 1973,7] The Constitution on the Liturgy [n.41] presents the local church as the highest manifestation of the Church when she meets as a liturgical assembly, especially in the celebration of the Eucharist. [cf. Zizioulas 1985,220, with the proviso that he finds the essence of the Church as Eucharistic assembly in the future rather than the past.]

It has been said that this text brought about a Copernican revolution because the local church could no longer be understood as being a planet circling in the gravitational field of the universal Church, but is " the unique Church of God in Jesus Christ, present in every celebration of the local Church by the continual action of the Holy Spirit." [Lanne, 1970, p.490.]

The Council was certainly conscious that these local churches are made up of people called by, and gathered together in, the Spirit. This is, of course,

connected with an understanding of the Church as a communion. There is however, in practice, something of a problem of deciding what exactly we mean by the local Church. The early Christian meaning of the Eucharistic assembly round the Bishop wherein

> The Church was always understood as the great mystery of the plan of God for the final destiny of the world, a mystery which was celebrated in the Eucharist and of which one became partaker as a member of a concrete local community. [Zizioulas, 1985, 254]

doesn't fit comfortably into the modern situation of a large diocese which is probably thought of by most people as an administrative unit, although Father Congar believes that the definition of the diocese in Lumen Gentium [23,1& 26.] and Christus Dominus,[11.] " can be applied perfectly" to the local Church understood as the Church of God in a particular place. [Congar 1983, II,26.] The parish is what is most often understood as the local Church, but whether this is often a true 'communion' of persons is problematical.

One can more often have a vivid portrayal of what I think is meant, in a monastic or religious community or when there is a grouping or congregation of people drawn together by mutual interest or sympathy, for example at a retreat, in Justice and Peace groups. The problem with this is that such comings together are of a temporary nature and there must surely be something permanent if we are to speak of a 'local church.' However they do give indications of the way in which the parish should develop; a more positive commitment than simply living in a particular area would be a start, a commitment which should incorporate a willingness for mutual service.

The principle, that the Holy Spirit is at work in individuals bringing them together, can be applied also to the Churches. In the Spirit the local Church, with a diversity of charisms and vocations, can be herself in communion with other such Churches. [Congar 1984a,171.] This was not really developed in the Council (except in Unitatis Redintegratio in connection with the Eastern Churches). Indeed it has been said that the Council, though often speaking of local or particular Churches, did not work out a theology of the local Church. [Lanne 1970,495.] Congar also notes this lack of theology and suggests that all parts of the communion must have an integral part to play in the constitution of the whole Church for

> When we say the Church is a community we mean that every living member is taking part and determining the whole life of the Church, not in an individualistic way, but in solidarity with others and in relation to the hierarchic structure of the Church. [Granfield 1967,259.]

There can be seen in this a change in emphasis, a progression, from his approach in Lay People in the Church . The community is put first, related certainly to the hierarchic structure, but no longer defined in terms of it, as an appendage to it. What Congar has tried to do is to give full value to the community aspect without losing sight of the given, structural aspect. His instinct is to see how all aspects, all insights can be incorporated into the overall view, in Christology as well as in ecclesiology, and since so much of theology involves the paradoxical an attempt at balance can look like indecision or 'fudging'. Yet a theology which emphasises breadth and an exposition, if perhaps not a total synthesis, of the data of Revelation, Tradition and Experience, is to be admired. There are different aspects of what we mean by Church and there is always going to be tension between the given, whether in the shape of Scripture or of institutional form, and the lived, the interpreted. It cannot be denied that Congar is aware of this dichotomy, and also of the dangers, both of one-sided emphasis and of a too-rigid dualism. He has attempted to redress the balance in ecclesiology by introducing a more pneumatological emphasis thus placing the institution at the service of the living, Spirit-indwelt community, leading to a more important place for the local Church. If this balanced, cautious, integrative approach had been followed more widely in the post- Council period some excesses, and the corresponding restrictions, might have been avoided.

4c. The Church is Apostolic

The obvious meaning is that the Church is in conformity with the origin of Christianity in the apostles. Congar says however that if one were to think that was all that it meant, one would miss the eschatological reference.

Apostolicity must be understood with reference not only to the beginning of the Church but also to its goal. It ensures the continuity of end with beginning, of foundation in Christ with fulfilment in him. Apostolicity keeps the Church true to God's intentions through all the vicissitudes of history. Apostolicity preserves the elements of the church institutional - Word, Sacrament and Ministry - till Christ will come again and judge.[Congar 1983,II,39.]

Congar agrees with Pannenberg that the apostles were not simple witnesses; their faithful testimony pointed forward to the eschatological era as well as backwards to the historical revelation. He also refers to the theology of John Zizioulas who distinguishes the historical pattern according to which the apostles were sent throughout the world to spread the gospel, and the eschatological pattern. In the former a scattering and a backward reference is perceived whereas in the latter there is a gathering together of the scattered people in one place, i.e. in the Eucharistic celebration which points to the eschatological assembly. Zizioulas would say that the Eucharist actually brings the eschaton into history. Through the Spirit we are incorporated into the pneumatically constituted Christ. Indeed Zizioulas understands a corporate Christ from the outset, made so by the Spirit; Christ from the beginning is not simply one, but is actually defined as relational because the Spirit is involved in his very being. Christ is not connected with the community only after the Resurrection but from the very beginning.

Congar says that he is fundamentally in agreement with Zizioulas that both patterns, the historical and the eschatological are necessary and praises the richness of his theology but says that he, Congar, would stress the historical dimension rather more than Zizioulas does.[Congar 1983,II,51] This is to be understood within Congar's framework of the Church seen as the time between the ascension of Jesus and his return, the time in which all that came about in Jesus, i.e. fellowship with God, salvation , may come about in many. Jesus is Alpha and Omega, the beginning of humanity's salvation and the one in whom it will all be consummated because " the parousial mystery is substantially the same as the Paschal mystery " and the apostolicity of the

Church ensures that there will be continuity between the two. [Congar 1957 & 65, 1985,70.]

Apostolicity is a foundation stone of the Church because anyone who undertakes the function of the apostolate is, in doing what he has been told by Christ to do, allowing himself to be the channel through whom Christ works. Through Christ himself he is doing the work of God. The apostle is not just an envoy but the 'other self' of the one sending. The Church preaches what the apostles preach - Christ crucified. "Apostolicity is the identity, almost the oneness of this apostolic mission throughout the centuries until the end". [Congar 1983,II,40.]

4c.1 The Spirit keeps the Church Apostolic.

The Holy Spirit plays a part in bringing about the continuity between Alpha and Omega. The Church is apostolic both because she witnesses to what has gone before and because she proclaims that what was witnessed in Christ's life, death and resurrection, is a saving reality pointing to future fulfilment. The role of the Spirit is seen as being a co-witness with the apostles [John 15.26-27] This co-witnessing is also mentioned in Acts 5,32; indeed the Spirit is associated with almost all aspects of the institution and spread of the early Church. This it is suggested reminds the Church in every century that she bears witness to the foundational events and must continue her mission. However the action of the Spirit did not end there. The Spirit is also, Congar states, the Spirit of faithfulness, the Spirit of truth - (2 Tim. 1.14.) This point is stressed by Irenaeus who links the charism of truth particularly to the bishops, the guarantors that with them, i.e. within the Church, is the genuine as opposed to heterodox, revelation. The same point is made in the calling of ecumenical councils 'in the Spirit'.

4c.2 Existential Implications.

On the question of apostolic authority Congar wants to make it clear that it is the Church which is held to be apostolic; it was to the Church, gathered together and of one mind with the Apostles, that the Spirit came at Pentecost. That is to say apostolicity is connected primarily with faith, though also with witness and service. There is a communion with the Apostles, and through them with the Father and the Son, the principle of which is the Holy Spirit. It is only within the understanding of the extension through time of this communion that the 'apostolic succession' in the technical sense is to be understood. [Congar 1983,II,45.] Objections are sometimes raised to the Catholic claim that the apostolate is preserved in the continuing Church, seeing in the claim a confusion of the original revelation with tradition. This is to misunderstand the Catholic teaching. The Catholic church does not purport to add anything to the original founding revelation. The apostle's task of setting out this foundation is not communicated. The Decree Lamentabili in 1907 condemned the proposition that revelation did not end with the apostles. The action of the Spirit in the Church maintaining the truthfulness of her teachings is not to be equated with the inspiration given to the apostles. Vatican I set this out clearly. No Church pronouncement is the word of God in the way Scripture is. All that the Spirit does is protect the original revelation in the teaching of the Church. Congar feels, however, that the claim to authority by the Roman Catholic Church is one of the most formidable obstacles in the path of unity. The way he looks at the subject is to consider the 'apostolic succession' of the Bishops within the wider context of the apostolicity of the Church considered as a communion of all in faith, extended through time, and grounded , as has been said, in the coming of the Spirit at Pentecost to the community gathered together with the apostles. This is presented liturgically when a Bishop is concentrated, by several bishops, in the midst of the people, thus bearing witness to the fact that he is part of the apostolic faith. This is the modern equivalent of the appointment of Bishops in the early Church "with the consent of the whole Church" referred to by Clement of Rome and in the Didache. "There is therefore in principle, no automatic juridical formalism in this question since the hierarchical function exists within the community of the ecclesia".[Congar 1983,45]

From this Congar goes on to explain the necessity of an epiclesis in the sacramental acts of the hierarchical Church and her ministers. If the Spirit

does not come there would only be 'rite'; the ritual act, however, points to the necessity also of institution by Christ.[Congar 1983, II,45-46]

There is no question of automatic authority for ministers per se. Congar had already set out, in Power and Poverty in the Church, how profoundly he believed in this.[Congar 1964a,53] The ecclesia comes first. Only within that can we speak of the heads of the Christian community. What is important about the Church is not the hierarchical power but the formation of spiritual men. The view of the Church as a system is out of touch with scripture, liturgical and patristic usage. A return to the sources "must go forward until it restores a completely evangelical concept of authority, a concept that will be both fully supernatural and fully communal".[Congar 1964a,78.]

It is the Spirit who is the principle of this evangelical authority because it is the Spirit who, in addition to keeping the Church faithful to the apostolic inheritance, aids her when she is called to affirm and define the faith. This has always been understood, even before the word 'infallible' came into use. In Congar's opinion 'indefectibility' is a better word to use for this concept, and expresses the ability of the Church, throughout history, to profess the saving truth , to make statements about the religious relationship. Indefectibility means the indestructibility of the faith on which and by which the Church is constructed.[Congar 1970b,611] The pastoral magisterium of the Church may make, and has made errors, but the Holy Spirit ensures that these will not ultimately prevail. [Congar 1983,II,46.] Protestants, Congar says, may be able to agree with this, but they stress that it is the Holy Spirit, not the Church, which is the subject of the indefectibility, and continues "We can gladly accept even this insistence provided we can also say that grace is given." [Congar 1083,II.46.]

4d.The Church is holy.

The holiness of the Church is woven in with her other characteristics of unity, catholicity, and apostolicity. " They interpenetrate each other." [Congar 1983,II,52.]

The New Testament does not speak about a 'holy 'Church. She is, however, Bride of Christ, (Eph.5,26,27.) her members are saints (R.12,19) and make up a holy priesthood, a holy nation and a holy temple. (1Pet.2,5 & 9. Eph.2,21.)

Congar follows Aquinas in believing that there is not an invisible Church of saints and a visible Church which contains sinners, but one Church made holy

by the indwelling Trinity.[Congar 1965,55.]

4d.1 The Spirit is the principle of the Church's holiness.

It is not just a metaphor to say that the Spirit is the soul of the Church. The statement contains the profound truth that only the divine can bring us to the divine; in the Church the Spirit is the divine dynamic principle moving us towards God.[Congar 1965, 58]

This does not mean that the Spirit 'sacralizes' the Church. There is both sinfulness and holiness within her. She like the Christian is involved in the struggle between flesh and spirit. She has exhibited many faults and inadequacies in her history and is always in need of reform.[Congar 1983,II,57] This was a subject which, taken up by Congar in 1950 in Vraie et Fausse Réforme dans L'Église, earned him the mistrust and displeasure of the Church authorities. His insistence that the Roman authorities should be open to the existence of problems, to their relevance for ecumenical debate, and his description of an 'integralist' mentality, rigid and institutionalised, won him, according to James Connolly, "undying opposition from certain churchmen." [Connolly1961,102.]

Congar's understanding is that what is from God in the Church, is holy, what is human is subject to sin. This was set out in the context of a fairly rigid understanding of the Church, though conceived first as mystery, as divided into an institutional and a life pole, the former preceding and forming the latter, and being composed of elements such as the deposit of faith, the sacraments, the apostolic powers, which came from Christ and structure the community of believers. The two aspects were united in the one Church of Christ which "is the result of a synergy of a gift freely given and which, being from God is perfectly pure, and an activity of man in which his liberty, his limits and his natural weakness play a part." [Congar (1950)1968, 97.]

Because of the human element she must pray that the Holy Spirit accompany all her actions -" this she does by accompanying all her actions by an epiclesis."[Congar 1968,153.]

The divine and the human elements in the Church must be held in balance. Too great a concentration on the former overshadows the co-operative part weak human beings play in the exercise of Christ's authority. Too great a concentration on the human weakness of the Church can make one blind to God's guiding power. Certainly the union between Christ and his Church will

only be perfect eschatologically and meantime she aspires to that perfection, under the rule of the Spirit certainly but only as 'arrah', as first-fruit.

4d.2 Existential Implications.

The Church is in the process of struggling towards an ideal. Although the Spirit dwells in the Church as a Person his coming did not make the Church sinless for the union with the her is not a union of being but is one of alliance grounded in God's will and faithfulness.
[Congar 1968,152] This Spirit, the 'Unknown One Beyond the Word' is forever calling God's people on towards their inheritance, inspiring reforms, calling forth initiatives for renewal. We can 'grieve' the Holy Spirit but we can also listen and co-operate with him as he makes of the Church a 'hagiophany' revealing the presence of another world, anticipating the Kingdom.[Congar 1983, II, 57-58]
Congar's vision of the Church as both gift and task is enriched by becoming more pneumatological. The two elements, the divine and the human find unity in the Spirit. A greater emphasis on the Spirit as present in the Church, not only in her intrinsically holy structure, but in fallible humanity allows for the possibility of a greater role and responsibility for the laity, the development of lay spirituality and lay ministry so that the people may be seen to be Church with the hierarchical ministry. The Spirit is the one who brings the eschatological Kingdom into the present and his presence should therefore bring about the kind of world Jesus preached and embodied in his actions.

5. The results of a communion ecclesiology.

It has been argued that Congar in presenting the Church as a communion whose principle is the Spirit, has opened up his ecclesiology to new or re-newed implications, a new understanding of oneness, catholicity, apostolicity and holiness resulting in possible changes in practice. Writing in 1969 Congar said that Vatican II set aside the notion of a Church which moulds her people but which is not shaped by them. By bringing into ecclesiology once more such concepts as the People of God and Charisms the Council recognised that Christian people have always brought something to the life of the Church. Congar quotes and approves Schillebeeckx's vision of the new aspect of the axis of the ecclesiology of the council as:

> A vertical decentralisation orientated towards Christ; a horizontal decentralisation of Rome towards the universal episcopacy and of the hierarchical ministry towards the people of God; of the Roman Catholic Church towards the other Churches and lastly the giving up of ecclesio-centralism."[Congar 1985a,89; Schillebeeckx 1965]

The model of communion itself generates certain specific concepts.

5.a. Collegiality.

Collegiality has to do with how the episcopal office is interpreted . Do Pope and Bishops form a college as did Peter and the Apostles, and if so, how is it to be understood and what follows from it? Collegiality is realised in the process by which authority is exercised in the Church by the Roman Pontiff in communion with the world's Bishop's, and is closely connected with the concept of the local Church and with that of Conciliarity. It also has affinities with sobornost in Orthodox theology. [Congar 1960, 307-310; Ch.1 supra.]
Congar, interviewed in 1967, when asked if he had started the discussion of collegiality said that this was not so. He had brought the term into the theological vocabulary but in the context of his research on the laity, a context quite different from that of bishops. He was discussing the relationship of laity to hierarchy, life to structure, in the Church, saying that the hierarchical principle was not the whole of God's design but "involves the complementing and give and take of a community and the fullness that comes from the association of the two." [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985,285.]

> I found that in the tradition of the church a communitarian structure always accompanied the hierarchic structure. I discovered that in the practical life of the church decisions were always made in community. I found numerous texts, in St. Cyprian and St. Leo for example, that insisted 'nulli populo invito detur episcopus'. A bishop is not given to a community against its will. It was in studying texts like this that I formulated the communitarian or collegial ideal. I even proposed to translate the orthodox term 'sobornost', to the degree that it is valid, as collegiality. [Granfield 1967,243.]

In fact the First Vatican Council announced the concept of collegiality though it also defined the universal jurisdiction and infallibility of the Pope, thus stressing the hierarchical apex. It did not, however, have time to make a pronouncement on the episcopate. Pope Paul VI at the opening of the second session of Vatican II said that its theology of episcopacy and collegiality completed Vatican I. Congar uses this as an example of tradition as a living reality. Tradition does not mean that something is simply taken up and passed on as it is. A subject can be in the tradition and yet introduce something new. Thus Vatican II set the papacy against a new background of collegiality. This is what Congar calls a re-reception. [Lauret 1988,54.]

The theology of collegiality of the Council understands that the Pope as Vicar of Christ holds supreme power in the Church " a power which he can always exercise unhindered"[Lumen Gentium22] The Bishops, as successors to the Apostles, form an apostolic college and " together with their head, the Supreme Pontiff, and never apart from him, they have supreme and full authority over the universal Church." [ibid.] The Pope, Congar says

> is in the college, but in the college he occupies a particular position which allows him to speak, as did Peter in the midst of the Twelve, in a quite personal way, freely and independently. All the same, even in this instance he is bound up with the others, and without them he would not be anything at all. [Lauret 1988,51.]

The Papacy and the College of Bishops is to be understood to-day within an ecclesiology, based on a truly Trinitarian notion of God, of a communion of local Churches, each with its own charisms, its own history, animated by and working together in the Spirit. The universal Church is this network of Churches, bound together in love and mutual service. (cf Durkheim's understanding of society). Indeed Congar understands the concept as deriving from the nature of the Church as communion; all share in the same spiritual realities, all should be present to one another, all should act together. Thus conceived it must have a permanent place in the authoritative mechanism of the Church.[Congar 1960, 301-302.]

The Holy Spirit is at the heart of collegiality because he is at the heart of the communion of the Church. It is the Holy Spirit who is the 'communicatio Christi', interiorizing in the many, throughout time and space, the one truth, the one revelation, i.e. he is the principle of the unity and catholicity with

which collegiality is intimately connected . The Holy Spirit is the maker of communion, breaking down the divisions which prevent it.[Congar 1960,312; Congar 1965,170f.]

5.a1 Relations between the Papacy and the College of Bishops

The bishop is the representative of his people, not their delegate, but Congar says, the one who personifies or recapitulates the body of the local Church, and it is as such that he forms a communion with other bishops under the authority of the Pope. In the first session of the Second Vatican Council Council the majority of the Bishops were in favour of collegiality in the whole Church, though Congar has said that some were radically opposed to it and so the emphasis was on that rather than on limited collegiality in the local Churches.

Although the Bishops are not individually infallible they can infallibly proclaim the doctrine of Christ. Indeed

> This is so even when they are dispersed throughout the world but preserving for all that amongst themselves, and with Peter's successor, the bond of communion, in their authoritative teaching concerning matters of faith and morals, provided they are in agreement that a particular teaching is to be held definitively and absolutely. [L.G.25.]

Catholics, however, still tend to see the Papacy as the ultimate reference point in all discussion of Church matters indicating that the juridical understanding of the Church is alive and well.

What then of the power which the Pope exercises? Is it strictly personal power (not 'personal' in the sense of acting as a private individual, but in a capacity of the highest authority in the hierarchy of the Church.) or collegial power exercised by the one who is head of the College? In other words who speaks for the Church, in whom is the revelatory power of the Spirit vested? Congar says that it must be remembered that the Church is both juridical and pneumatic but it is the latter which is dominant since it is the Spirit, as the principle of life in the Church, who demands that all the members, including the Pope, respect the structure which includes the college of bishops. [Congar 1971,.200-201.]

Congar himself has not completely decided on the exact position. [Lauret

1988,51.] In Ministères et Communion Écclésiale he rejects the purely monarchical theory of the Papacy as being insufficiently grounded in Scripture and the early tradition. He examines the view put forward by Karl Rahner, that the power is always the power of the college with and under the Pope as its head.[Congar 1971,209ff.] Rahner's approach was to stress the collegial principle, that is there is one supreme power; the authority of the Pope is as head of the college of Bishops. The single power may be exercised as a 'collegiate act' in the true sense, or through an act of its head the Pope [Rahner 1973,55]

Rahner says effectively, that there cannot be two supreme powers. When the college acts it does so with the Pope as its head , and when the Pope seems as if he is acting alone, he is acting as head of the college. The college of bishops, and the Council, clearly enjoy supreme power, and they include the Pope. Lumen Gentium clearly says that the College has this power, it is not that authority is conferred through collegiality, and it may use it either in a conciliar way (in an ecumenical council) or extra conciliarly provided only that it does so in co-operation with the Pope. [Rahner 1969,362.]

Congar objected to Rahner's collegial understanding as not giving sufficient weight to the teaching of Vatican I that the unity of Pope and bishops is analogous to that of head and members, with the latter being in a relationship of dependence on the former who has a measure of universal power which the bishops do not have. He holds that the supreme power rests in both the Pope and the college in different ways and bases this on the New Testament which shows that the supreme power is communicated twice; first to Peter [Mt.16,19] and secondly to the college of apostles [Mt.18,18; 28,18-20; Jn.20,21-23.] He agrees with Rahner that there is only one supreme power, but believes that there are two titles to it. This does not, however, prejudice the collegial thesis.[Congar 1971,210-211.]

It is because the College includes the Pope, and he has a special place in it, that the theory arose that there are two powers, the collegial and the monarchical. Congar believes that it is a defective doctrine of God which give rise to a paternalistic conception of authority. Authority is seen as coming from a 'monotheistic' God. It is forgotten in this that the Son and the Spirit present other models of action and authority and that the whole People of God reflects, each member according to his or her condition, the qualities appropriated to the three Trinitarian Persons. All authority comes from the Father but it has a servant quality from the Son and is exercised within the

community made by the Spirit. [Congar 1974,309] Congar says that

> The monarchical theory, according to which everything depends on the one (monos) who communicates his power to the Bishops, was still held at Vatican II...But this theory cannot be sustained. It is historically indefensible.[Lauret 1988, 52.]

He does acknowledge that there are traces of the monarchical idea in an acceptance that there is a final authority for the resolution of debate, but says that this is not truly monarchical but " a power peculiar to the Bishop of Rome as successor to Peter within the college." [Lauret 1988,52.] He gives as an example of this distinctively Papal power the fact that at the beginning of the second session of the Second Vatican Council Pope Paul VI presented a motu proprio creating the synod of Bishops even before this was decided upon by the Council in the decree on the episcopal ministry, because he wanted to indicate his independence from the Council.

Since Congar says that he thinks he will keep to Rahner's view that the power is always the power of the college, it seems that he has put aside reservations based on a desire to hold on to the idea that the Pope has, in a special way, supreme pastoral power.[Lauret 1988, 51] He has already recognised that the Second Vatican Council brought about a profound change; away from the notion of a papal monarchy to a deeper understanding of collegiality.[Congar 1971,107.]

Congar does not follow those who have suggested that the role of the Pope should be defined along sacramental lines; the papacy as the sacrament of Church unity. The papacy is not the result of a sacrament and so the primacy of the Pope is not sacramental. The Council implicitly rejected the sacramental approach to the papacy though it did situate all ecclesial life including the episcopacy, within a sacramental understanding of the mystery of the Church. There is no question of the Pope being a kind of super-bishop, he is simply a bishop; this is the apex of the sacramental order. [Lanne1970,499.] At the time of Pius XII, according to Congar there was a tendency to see the Pope as a kind of deputy head of the Body of Christ. He was successor of Peter first, and almost it would seem accidentally Bishop of Rome. Such a separation of the Bishop from the local church is conducive to the vision of the universal Church as a somewhat abstract hierarchical edifice with the Pope , an almost mystical being, at its head, just the kind of model

which Congar was keen to see revised. This is why he favours the understanding of the Pope as authoritative within the college while at the same time recognising that there is a sense in which the Pope can be seen as a focal point for unity. There is a symbolic value of the papacy as "the Icon of communion". The unity of the western church has become concentrated on one man, with the power that goes with that. The danger is of ending up with too monarchical an approach. In the eastern church there is a "synodical logic which puts the emphasis on exchanges between local churches" so their unity is synodical. The logic of unity concentrated on the Pope and that of synodical unity are not, he says, contradictory. "A fully Catholic Church - if we achieve unity one day - must implement both logics, that of the primacy and that of the synod." [Lauret 1988,56.]

One of the manifestations of the collegial principle is the growing importance of bishop's conferences in the Church. Some, such as those of the Latin American bishops at Medellin and Puebla have produced far-reaching teaching.

Episcopal conferences are not divine institutions like the college of bishops. They are not however simply practical either though the cultural differences between the local churches and the different problems they face in their respective areas suggest that they should play an important role in decision-making and government in the Church. They have a theological function. The church, understood as a communion, though she does not have to hold councils, is essentially conciliar in the sense of 'collegial' and 'synodical'. It is of her nature to gather people together. By analogy there is a basis for episcopal conferences just as there is for councils - in the nature of the church. Father Congar recently was asked for a response to a report that Rome was intending to limit the powers of the international bishop's conferences and that Father Umberto Betti, rector of the Pontifical Lateran University and consultant to the Congregation for Bishops, had stated that the episcopal conference has no dogmatic foundation proper and so is not a divinely instituted structure, and is reported as answering

> I don't believe that this is totally true. They are a collegiate form.The college is a divine institution because it is the succession of the Twelve. To a degree the episcopal conferences are an emanation of the college in certain situations. This is where I see their existence having a dogmatic foundation.[The Catholic Herald,1993.]

Rahner also finds the doctrinal basis for the bishop's conferences in the fact that since they belong to the episcopal college, successor to the apostolic college, they have a certain role to play in the universal Church and not just in their own dioceses.[Rahner 1969,275-279.]

The question of the appointment of bishops directly by the Pope has been raised recently. It has happened in Germany and in Holland. In the latter case the appointment of a conservative Bishop to a reluctant diocese has led to great tensions. Congar would, it is suggested, see the problem as that of the papal authority being used on the church rather than within the church, perhaps as an example of a succumbing to the monarchical logic.

It would be a pity if the principle of collegiality were to be eroded for the consequence of the development of the 'communion' ecclesiology has, in this area brought a greater manifestation of the catholicity of the Church for

> The witness of the Church is heard through a multiplicity of voices and the independence of the national, local churches has been manifested in a far greater measure than in earlier times. [Vischer 1987, 236, in Alberigo et al. 1987]

5b.Conciliarity.

A communion ecclesiology, based on an anthropology in which the human person realises himself or herself in community, has as another of its expressions, the doctrine of conciliarity. This concept is concerned with the relationship between communities, and in its episcopal form, means the coming together of bishops in councils. Ideally in a communion ecclesiology all elements of the Church are understood as working together in an active unity, not simply serving an institution, but harmonising their initiatives in a communion.

This takes place within the understanding of the Church as primarily sacrament - visible expression of the inner reality of God's plan of saving grace brought to fruition in Christ, now made present and effective by his Spirit in the ecclesial body - and it is within this understanding that one is to interpret the other aspect of the Church; she exists in the world of human beings, is a concrete historical entity , needing a measure of societal organisation. Part of this organisation seems to be, for Congar, the ensuring that the communion remains truly united in the realities of faith which are its foundation, by the action of the bishops in council coming together to act as judices fidei;

> they decide, define, and - united to their head or leader-impose a law on the universal church (if the council is ecumenical or general) or on a part of the church (if the council is restricted, i.e. provincial, national or continental). A single decision, a unique act of judgement, is made by a large number of pastors forming a single principle of thought and judgement; the subject who acts is the body or college of bishops as such, in which the Bishop of Rome, as Peter's successor, is in the position of caput. [Congar 1972,106-7.]

These councils are an expression of conciliarity which itself flows from the nature of the Church as a communion. [Congar 1983, 33.] As such conciliarity is closely connected with the theology of the local Church. It is the bishops, the heads of the local Churches, who come together in council and they do so, not as delegates in the modern democratic sense, but as representatives in the old sense of personification in which a body is represented by its head. It is of the essence of a council that it should be an assembly. A written consultation

exercise, such as that undertaken by Pius IX before the promulgation of the dogma of the Immaculate Conception of Mary , is not a council though it is an exercise of the Church's collegiality and so of her conciliar nature. The 'council by writing' would produce something which had the same juridical value as a conciliar decision, but an act of the Pope alone would also have the same value in juridical terms. However " The plenitude would be lacking that the most papalist of theologians assert to be the prerogative of the conciliar action in comparison with the infallible act of the Pope himself when acting alone." [Congar 1972,111]

The council as an assembly allows not only for the exercise of communion but also encourages mutual help and enrichment. If one were to look at it simply from a juridical point of view, as producing a directive, one would only be concerned with notions of obligation and external validity, ignoring the internal aspect and " the intimate nature of things." In patristic thought the coming together which is of the essence of a council is connected with an understanding of God's saving plan of grace being the restoration of the fragmented unity of humanity. Just as the restoration of the image of God in the human being consists in coming to reflect once more the Trinitarian nature of the Creator, so the restorative function of councils implies a coming together, a re-unification of what has been divided.[Congar 1972, 111-113.]

Father Congar says that the greatest difference between ancient and modern ecclesiology is that the former included anthropology while the latter came to be the theory of a system, a book of public law. Ancient anthropology was an anthropology of communion wherein the person re-discovered a likeness to God. If this is taken into ecclesiology we find the situation where it is this ' communicating humanity' which is the subject of the Church's actions and attributes. [Congar 1972,116.] Therefore

> The council, a gathering of the Church in its totality and unity is the realisation and expression of the Christian man as a man of communion, and, on the episcopal level, what might be called a collegial man."[Congar 1972,118.]

5b1 The Role of the Holy Spirit in the Council.

Councils are, says Congar, classically understood as convened 'in the Holy

Spirit' though it is Christ who is understood as presiding. Christ and the Spirit work together to bring about an assembly united in truth. As had been said [supra,4a] the Spirit at Pentecost was given when there was a coming together of those who were of one mind, because the Spirit is both the creator of that unity and the gift within it. A similar action, Congar believes, takes place in the Council and he understands it to be the tradition of the Church that it is Christ and his Spirit who are the true authors of conciliar decrees, so that the final conciliar act is one of the college and the Spirit. [Congar 1972, 122.] The unanimity achieved is both the fruit of the Spirit and the sign of the presence of the Spirit. This presence is like that in which God is present by His Spirit in a sacramental action - as the presence promised to the institution He has called into existence as guarantee of His fidelity. This does not mean that councils are divine institutions, for " though conciliarity is essential to the Church, the concrete form of the council does not belong to the structure which the Lord gave his Church."[ibidp126.] Councils are not the church; they are events in the life of the Church connected with the need to express the human desire for communion and for re-creation in man of the image of God. The presence in them is " a covenantal presence by which God has promised to be active by His grace in ecclesial actions when the conditions are met and the structures of the covenant are respected." [Congar 1972,127-8.]

5c Reception.

In recent legal scholarship there has been much discussion of 'reception' particularly in the context of the use made by, for example Scots law, of Roman law. The concept of reception in theology has an affinity with the legal concept and refers to the way in which the Church incorporates into her life, a particular teaching or custom. Congar defines it as

> the process by means of which a church (body) truly takes over as its own a resolution that it did not originate in regard to its self, and acknowledges the measure it promulgates as a rule applicable to its own life... It includes a degree of consent , and possibly of judgement, in which the life of a body is expressed which brings into play its own, original spiritual resources. [Congar 1972 a,45.]

The history of the Church furnishes examples of the process of reception at work, from the formation of the canon of Scripture itself (first in fact then in Church decrees) through the reception of Councils, of liturgical forms, of various ecclesiastical disciplines to what Congar sees as a modern example - the fact that Vatican II envisages a collegial initiative emanating from the bishops which could only be a collegiate act if the Pope approved it - the text speaks of reception as a Papal privilege. It truly is about reception because " it is a matter of consent (by means of judgement) by one church body to a resolution put forward by others."[Congar 1972a,45.] J.M.R. Tillard believes there is a 'reception' by Rome of initiatives coming from the Bishop's conferences which evidences a new 'praxis' in acceptance by Rome of the notion of sister Churches.[Tillard,1977] One could perhaps also speak of reception in the ecumenical context, when with the possibility of the re-establishment of communion between Churches in mind, there might be acceptance of a teaching of one Church into the life of another.

The concept has, then, a legal and a theological aspect, the latter qualifying the former. Reception concerns the way communities grasp truths of faith. It is a concept which is particularly associated with the time when the Church was more widely understood as a communion of Churches. Thus in the communion context of the early Church it meant the way in which a local Church received or accepted, for example, a conciliar decree. Theologically it derives from a theology of communion. Reception is something active; the

faithful and the local church are not passive but have "a faculty of discernment, of co-operation with the determination of their forms of life. [Congar 1972a,62.] It is then an essential part of Tradition for nothing would be effectively transmitted if it were not also received. [Congar 1978a,102.]

In this process of the Christian community receiving or accepting a particular teaching, the Holy Spirit is involved. It is he who allows the community to recognise that a teaching is for its good. [Congar 1984a,309.] Truth, however, is everyone's concern and responsibility.[Congar 1966,321; 1972 a, 62] The faithful have a part to play in discerning that truth just as Church leaders have a right and a duty to teach authoritatively.[Congar 1962a,51; 1971,162.] The whole ecclesia is the subject receiving the deposit of truth under the guidance of the Spirit whose work is relative to the truth that Jesus taught. He bears witness to Jesus and brings to remembrance what he said, and does so throughout history. [Congar 1986, Ch 4.]

The hierarchy of the Church does not have a monopoly of the Spirit; he is at work in revelation, in individuals and in the community. Congar thinks, much as does Calvin, that God works both by His Spirit and by His Word. Scripture and the inspiration of the Spirit both have to be acknowledged but because of the danger of individualism the latter has to be considered not just in the individual but also in the Church. This does not mean that the norm is simply the papal magisterium. The normative documents, the sensus fidei and the charism of ordained ministry work together, " in a sense complete and condition one another." [1986,32-34.] A whole dimension is lost when these things are ignored and for communion is substituted a pyramidal Church in which the Holy Spirit enters only as the guarantor of the infallibility of the hierarchical courts. The transition from one view of the Church to the other is, says Congar , accompanied by a change of emphasis; from truthful content being seen as primary, protected by the Church, there is a movement to the primacy of authority, i.e." a transition from the traditio passiva to the traditio activa, or from traditum to tradens." [Congar ,1972a,61.]

By this Congar means that instead of there being a primary concern with the truth of the doctrine - as in the authority of the Nicene Creed being in its conformity with the apostolic faith and authoritative power being seen only as adding to this an obligatory norm - the situation arises where the charism necessary for handing on the truth is interpreted as juridical power per se. It is only where the content of truth is taken into account that the 'ecclesia' can be said to have an activity of discernment or reception.

Why is the concept of reception most easily comprehensible within an understanding of the Church as a communion? The Church is one and in matters which concern her unity and her faith all must be unanimous. There are two routes to unity, obedience and reception. In a Church structured as local individual Churches unanimity should be "as living independent subjects." [Congar 1972a,62.] Obedience has a part to play but it is only seen as the means of arriving at unity in an institutional Church understood as a society subject to a monarchical papal authority. In such a Church 'reception' would mean simply obedience to a juridical pronouncement. Within an understanding of the Church as communion a place is given to the fact that not everything is laid down in the tradition and dogmatic formulae themselves require adherence which call upon "not merely volition but upon intellect and its conditioning factors which are culture knowledge, language and so on." [ibid]

The basis for the ecclesiology of communion on which reception is founded depends on an understanding that the universal Church cannot err in faith, and on the fact that the unity of the Church with its complementary dimensions of catholicity and apostolicity is the work of the Holy Spirit. What is really being acknowledged and expressed is the tradition of the Church.[Congar 1972a, 63.] The unanimity intended by the Councils of the Church of the first millennium was not an expression of the sum total of individual understandings " but a totality such as that of the memory of the Church." [ibid] The Church believes because the truth is handed down.

Understood thus, Congar says, reception is no more than the extension of the conciliar process. He notes that Orthodox theology grounds this in Trinitarian theology - the unity of the churches as personal subjects coming together in a unity which is not imposed on them, and in which their individuality is not obscured, being a reflection of a Trinitarian theology in which the individual hypostases are not obscured by affirmations of their unity.

> Authority is evidently common to the three Persons, but each of them brings to it his own hypostatic mark, which ought to be reflected in the Church; the monarchy of the Father and the authority of the creator; the submission of the Son exercising his power within a rule of service; the intimacy of the Spirit who inspires initiatives tending to the kingdom of God, and a communion in which each individual is

alive to whatever another may reveal to him. [Congar 1972 a, 64.]

In its legal aspect reception creates "neither legitimacy nor a legal force of obligation." What then does it do? Congar looks to Sohm who attributes to it a purely declaratory value. Sohn's main theological thesis was that the idea of Church excludes that of law for the truth of the Church must be grasped by looking to what is originally given in Scripture, and this was essentially charismatic and spiritual.[Congar 1973b, 263-294] The Church is the place where God's action is seen, where it manifests itself in consensus and unanimity; this within the general understanding that in the early Church there was no law, only the action of the Spirit. He understands the decisions by which certain facts or truths are 'accepted' or 'received' as being interventions of the Spirit who directs the Church. They are of value to the Church as such and not primarily because of their reception. Congar says that he is not far from subscribing to this view.[Congar 1972a,65.] He does however make the reservation that Sohm does omit something of the early Church situation. We can see his view, however, as another indication of how far along the pneumatological line Congar has progressed. He concludes

> Reception is not constitutive of the juridical quality of decision. It has no bearing on the formal aspect of the action but on its content. It does not confer validity, but affirms, acknowledges and attests that this matter is for the good of the Church.[Congar 1972a,66.]

In conclusion, this chapter has demonstrated how Congar by placing an increasing emphasis on the pneumatological in the Church, has been able to develop a fuller understanding of her nature as a communion, which not only is Scriptural and truly Trinitarian but also enables him to explain more fully her identifying characteristics and to relate more coherently the local to the universal Church.

CHAPTER SEVEN.
THE HOLY SPIRIT AT WORK IN THE COMMUNITY OF THE CHURCH

1.The Holy Spirit and Tradition.

2.Truth in the living Church.

3.Does the Spirit still speak through the Prophets.

4.Charismatic renewal,

5.The Holy Spirit and the Sacraments

The purpose of this chapter is to show further that Congar's pneumatological insights are not simply academic speculation but are understood by him to apply to real aspects of Church life and to suggest that this is confirmation of his pneumatological stand-point.

1.The Holy Spirit and Tradition.

Congar is a Roman Catholic theologian and a characteristic of his Church is an adherence to Tradition in addition to Scripture as an authoritative source, with an authority coming from God Himself. This was affirmed by the Council of Trent. In the period after this,

Tradition was often understood as apostolic doctrine not to be found in the canonical Scriptures, static, undeveloping, handed down intact, and was directed against the Reformation doctrine of sola scriptura. As through time and history it became clear that Catholic doctrine was infinitely more developed and more complicated than that of the early Church the idea that Tradition develops had to be accepted and in some cases that development was equated with the teaching of the magisterium. Pius XII however, in his 1950 encyclical Humani Generis, speaks of the two sources of Revelation, Scripture and Tradition, with the teaching of the magisterium as a third but subordinate theological resource, dependent on Scripture and Tradition for all its material.

'Tradition is a concept with many aspects. It is the means whereby the message of salvation is passed on and received, a process which not only involves the individual but also the community, and it is the content of the message. Congar believes that the Church is the only subject adequate to receiving the revealed deposit of truth and that this is the concern of everyone, each according to his or her charism.[Congar 1962a,115] At the Second Vatican Council Congar was, in 1964, appointed to the sub-committee which was to revise the schema on Tradition after the earlier version had met with opposition, and, according to Avery Dulles, he " exerted major influence on what was to become Chapter 2 of Dei Verbum."[Dulles 1992, 93] Central to his understanding is the notion of Tradition not as a dead verbal message mechanically passed down, but as a living reality. In this he is following in the footsteps of Moehler who, influenced by the Romantic Movement, emphasised the concept of 'living tradition', especially in his early work. Whatever form Tradition takes it is not a body of knowledge to be set up

against Scripture but the footprint of the living Church, the People of God, believing, worshipping, accepting the truths of Revelation.

Congar's understanding of tradition accords an important role to the Holy Spirit. Tradition is considered as being related to the time of the Church " which we might no less aptly term the time of the Holy Spirit." [Congar 1966,264.] It is considered in its relation to the past and to the future. The gap between constitutive revelation and the time of the Church must be bridged and the agent involved is the Holy Spirit. The redemptive acts of Christ happened in the past, yet the Christian believes that they are in some sense still actively present to us in a way that other heroic past acts are not. We are said to be able to interact with the content of the Christian mystery, we die and rise again with Christ in baptism, we share his very being in the Eucharist so that we might live forever with him.

Christians are beings who believe that, as well as being involved in history as is all of creation, they are also involved in the divine/human reality of sacred or salvation history. In the course of this God entered into a covenant relationship with humankind, first under the Old Dispensation and finally in the New Covenant revealed in the death and Resurrection of Jesus Christ and the sending of his Spirit.. Whenever any human being enters freely into this covenant relationship he appropriates the saving truth for him or herself. This is the moment when by the power of the Spirit that moment of salvation history unites the human and the divine. [Congar 1966,259.] It is the Spirit who breaks down the bonds of place and time and allows the events of the past to have their present and future saving meaning because

> It is the characteristic work of the Holy Spirit to effect a communication between realities despite their limits and the distances separating them,(2 Cor.13,13.)... The Spirit, unique and eternal - and this implies his entire presence in one single instant without temporal extension - brings to birth in men's hearts the kingdom of God, and thus foreshadows the 'God who is all in all ' of the eschatological kingdom.[Congar 1966, 261]

Congar argues that

> when the living God Himself is the agent of historical events - not just by His general providence, but acting to constitute another element in salvation history, a 'mystery' - he communicates to acts which take place in time certain possibilities and a density which surpass the conditions of earthly time. They are inserted into another sphere of existence, the eschatological order, which has for its principle the Holy Spirit. [Congar 1966, 261]

He thus links up the being with the function of the Spirit to make comprehensible the ways of God with humanity. In addition, he who is the interior principle of the mission of Christ and of the Apostles is also the interior principle of the ministry of the Church, animating it and " concelebrating with it in the testimony which it gives." [Congar 1966,313.] The Spirit is then the principle of unity in the tradition.

We must not forget that sacred history is also human history, the time when human beings respond to the initiative of God, when the deposit of faith is passed on through time. Congar is at pains to ensure continuity between the normative apostolic expression of the mystery of the faith and its transmission in the time of the Church. He is conscious also however, of the human dimension present in the time of the Church and of the fact that the declarations of the teaching authority are different in kind from those of the Apostles. Tradition then, for Congar also means the **interpretation** of Scripture and is allied to the indefectibility of the Church. 'There are two elements in the transmission of the message of salvation, the text and the life of the Church. [Congar 1966,375.] There is, therefore, a sense of development which allows a place for the work of the Holy Spirit in a Church whose history " is characterised by a tension between an ideal of plenitude and an ideal of purity."[Congar 1964b, 147]

His understanding of the dynamic aspect of tradition has, he says, the same central themes as that of Blondel. [Congar 1966,216.] Blondel had tried to find a way of interpretation somewhere between the alternatives of total acceptance of the Church's traditional doctrinal interpretation of what happened in history, and the historico-critical methods of secular research. He found the key to his mediate way in the concept of Tradition, not in the sense of a kind of supplement to Scripture but understood as a power which does not merely conserve and pass on, but which initiates, in the sense that it re-discovers, re-defines the truth that was lived as the collective life of the

Church's faith brings forth meaning. For Blondel the initial deposit of faith is inviolable, but it has to be practised, and it is in this happening that light is shed back on the source, revealing more of what was hidden, making comprehensible what was not fully understood or formulated. There is however, a sense in which Blondel believes that tradition may legitimately supplement what Christ left to us. This he understands as happening when the work of the Spirit interacts with human history. Congar has his doubts about this aspect of Blondel's theology in that he feels this writer played down the importance of the historical evidence of the Apostolic writers as communicating a theological interpretation of the facts which has in itself the character of a normative, objective fact. In addition he minimised the fact that the faith of the Church cannot create meaning but can only draw it out, and did not develop the part played by the magisterium. [Congar 1966, 366-367]
Aidan Nichols says that Congar's account

> though better informed exegetically and theologically than Blondel's, fundamentally re-creates his. To it Congar adds from his own reading of the 'great pedagogues' the nuance that Tradition is, above all, an educative milieu for faith." [Nichols 1989,38.]

For Congar the one Spirit speaks through the prophets, is at work in the Apostles, inspires the Scriptures and animates the Church. There are, however, differences of degree in his working. In inspiring the foundational Scriptures the work of the Spirit is qualitatively different from his work in the Church. It is this difference in degree which ensures that it is Scripture which is normative. This is in line with the general Roman Catholic understanding that the charisms of the Apostolic founders and of the inspired writers were ones which did not belong to the post-apostolic Church in general.
Congar's theology of tradition is intimately connected with a theology of history as he moves away from a view of the Church which concentrates on the divine at the expense of the historical, human element. His interests and his influence probably helped to bring about the ecumenical cast of Vatican II's presentation of tradition with its emphasis on the centrality of the transmission of the central message of Scripture and the early creeds.

2.Truth in the living Church

The Holy Spirit is understood by Congar to keep the Church faithful to the faith of the Apostles. Indeed there is something in the way in which the church, all of it, lives out her one, holy, catholic and apostolic life which in practice which keeps her true to her origins. It is not just a case of the laity obeying the hierarchy but of both together trying to live the Christian life, each bringing his or her own charism. Congar finds this ecclesial principle rooted in 'the missions of Christ and the Holy Spirit with their duality and unity'. While he is convinced that the apostolic revelation must be placed on a different level from that brought about by the Spirit's continuous presence in the Church, in line with his Thomist understanding of truth, and can say of Christian knowledge that "the Church instructs herself through contact with the facts", the human knower is not entirely passive.[Congar 1961,98;1968, 205.] This is why he can commend the Father's notion of the Spirit working in a revelatory way in the Church as drawing attention to the fact that revelation always takes place in the present. It takes place in the life of the individual and in the life of the Church. There are two aspects to revealed truth - the given, and the faithful response. The union of the two can be seen in the use of texts in the liturgy and the spiritual life. The Spirit who is truth has the role of "making knowledge present in continuity".[Congar 1983, II,29.] The Catholic Church has been accused of confusing continuity with immutability, but with Mochler and Newman came the exploration of development within continuity. The Second Vatican Council, probably influenced by these ideas, mediated by Congar and others, set out a dynamic notion of tradition.

In the 'mystery' of Jesus Christ is the fullness of the truth of reality. This truth is safeguarded in the Church by the action of the Spirit. By the Spirit also, through the faith of the members, that truth is continually witnessed to in time and space.

It is his belief that going hand in hand with objectivity of revelation, which exists and is normative, is some in-built capacity in man enabling him to be the subject of this revelation.[Congar 1985, 33-34.] As a result God is constantly revealing himself to those who live by faith.[Congar 1983,II,30.] Is this more than a making-present of a total revelation already given? Can it be more than that? The Catholic church has always placed a high value on the virtue of obedience and has shown a distrust for 'private interpretation'. However the failure to allow a measure of personal creativity has been

denounced by many. Congar quotes George Bernanos:

> The sabotage of that sublime and necessary faculty of the soul known as judgement can only lead to catastrophes ... men trained to blind obedience are those who are also prone to sudden blind disobedience. Obedience without discussion does not in any sense mean the same as obedience without understanding and complete docility is not so very far removed from complete revolt. [Congar 1986, 54.]

If a following of rules is not accompanied by an internal reception and acceptance of those rules one either finds mindless external acceptance or anarchy.
H.L.A. Hart, in the legal sphere makes this internal aspect so important as to be necessary for the very definition of rule governed behaviour:

> What is necessary is that there should be a critical reflective attitude to certain patterns of behaviour as a common standard, and that this should display itself in critical (including self critical) demands for conformity and in acknowledgements that such criticism and demands are justified. [Hart 1994,57.]

Congar expresses the same insight when he says that "What is required is that what is done should be the activity of a person, that a person with his own personal conviction should be really the subject of that activity".[Congar 1986,55.]
This he believes can only be done when the Church is seen as "A spiritual communion that has a social structure". [ibid.] In a sense this turns upside down the traditional idea of the primacy of the institutional church over the passive members. It replaces that view with the concept of a living Church not an institution which has 'life' superadded. It derives, as we have seen, from a Spirit-centred approach and is much more in line with the idea of Church in the early centuries. The vitality of a Church seen primarily as a spiritual communion "would be put to optimum use in a climate of freedom and trust, in which desiderata and new ideas would have time to mature, to spread through the body of believers without causing damage".[Congar 1986,55.]
Since the Decree Lamentabili in 1907, (in opposition to Loisy's view that revelation continued in the 'religious intuitions of humanity' developing and

growing in relation to God and man,) insisted that revelation was closed with the death of the last apostle, this has had to form part of any treatise on revelation. Congar says that Lamentabili also rejected George Tyrrell's view that revelation appeals to a prophetic call still heard in believers. However Tyrrell accepted that the revelation given by Christ and the apostles includes all that is necessary for salvation and that revelation ended with the death of the last apostle in the sense that everything later had to be measured against this - a position which Congar places as close to that of Rahner, de Lubac and Schillebeeckx which he deems to be correct. They see the closure of revelation to mean, according to Congar "that the witness borne to Christ through and in whom the revelation of God's plan and his mystery was fulfilled, was secured and terminated at that moment".[Congar 1986,57.] The Second Vatican Council confirmed the idea of closed revelation but left out the words "closed at the death of the apostles" though they were requested to include this.

The way then, is left open for "revelation" in the historical life of the Church. This will not however add to the deposit of apostolic faith. Thus the definition of the dogma of the Assumption of Our Lady would be seen as revelation in the tradition and life of the Church. A revelation of God still building up his Church through his Spirit.

Congar also says that private revelations have played a part in the history of the Church and that the lives of the saints can be seen as commentaries on Scripture or indeed as God's word in action. Prophetic insight, faithful to the confession of the apostles and in communion with the faith and tradition of the church, helps Christianity reinterpret its doctrines and goals in relation to the modern world.[Congar 1986,8.] Congar sees this gift, subsisting in the Church, making it, as a body, prophetic, and as Scripture testifies the Spirit is linked with prophecy.

3. Does the Spirit still speak through the Prophets?

In the old testament the prophets spoke in the name of Yahweh telling of His plan and His demands. In the Pauline writings prophecy is sometimes seen as disclosing God's intentions (1 Timothy, 1.18 and 4.14) but more usually, in Paul, and in Acts also, it is a charismatic office which is also incorporated into the Church as a community (1 Corinthians, 14.29 and 1 Thes. 5.21). In his characteristic fashion Congar expresses his view through quotation of another. [Perrot 1973,29-30] The title 'prophet' is attached to a class or order to which the individual belongs, i.e. there is a group of prophets recognised by the Church and it is the community which decides if the individual belongs to it. It is **within** the Church.There is no distinction made between 'charismatic' and 'institutional' ministries for "All the ministries are charismatic and there is no group of ministries that is not institutional." [Congar 1986,64.]

Congar interprets the 'prophets' mentioned in Ephesians 2,20 and 3,5 as different from the 'apostles', being those who carry out a ministry of living faithfulness to and interpretation of, the original apostolic kerygma.[Congar 1986,65] There is no discontinuity, however, between the one who lays the foundation and the one who builds on it (1 Cor.3,10) for the one foundation is Christ. In other words the Holy Spirit works in the prophets in continuity with, and with reference to, the work of Christ in the building of the Church. This reading of the text establishes continuity between the constitutive period of revelation and the time of the Church.

Congar acknowledges that the charism of prophecy existed in the early Church but asks what was its precise meaning, exhortation, ecstasy or prediction? In the latter form, he shows, it has cropped up from time to time in the Church and he accords it validity in certain cases and ties this in with the exhortation, since Vatican II, to study the signs of the times, an exhortation of Pope John XXIII grounded in the knowledge that God speaks through events and human beings.[Congar 1983,II,33]

Turning to the meaning deriving from his interpretation of Ephesians 2,20 and 3,5, he thinks that a deep understanding of scripture and the mysteries of God is an extension of early prophecy. He believes this is what Newman means by the "prophetic tradition" as distinguished from the apostolic tradition, ' a complex chain of explanations, interpretations and expressions of faith provided by the doctors and spiritual writers of the Church.' [Congar

1986,68.] Combining this understanding with what he as said above it is clear that he sees that the Church must answer the questions put to her to-day by keeping faith with the apostolic inheritance but also using all her resources and all her discernment to re-interpret her teaching and her goals.

The word 'prophet' is sometimes used for people who have had a certain vision and commitment which opened new ways forward, for example Pope John XXIII, Martin Luther King and Tielhard de Chardin. We could also suggest the liberation theologians. Going even beyond the Christian sphere, it could be asked if it was possible that the secular world could teach us of God in a new way and if the Spirit is involved in this. Is it possible for there to be a kind of prophecy which does not explicitly refer to Jesus Christ? Could an exhortation to man to be fully a person for example be prophetic? Congar's answer to this is a qualified 'yes'.[Congar 1986,68] Study of the world and of human beings cannot, however, replace contemplation of the Word of God in Scripture and handed down in the Tradition of the Church, but God also speaks " through events and other human beings."[Congar 1983,II,33.] To discover when and where would entail a study of the sociological movements in the world, but in the light of the Gospel.

Given that God does speak through His world the question is one of interpretation. It means that scripture has to be interpreted in history - hermeneutically rather than exegetically. The difficulty is in knowing if one is interpreting events properly. This can only be ensured if positive revelation is kept central. The danger is that man, not God, becomes the focal point.

It is Congar's view that the Holy Spirit is involved in this process whereby God still speaks. It is the role of the Holy Spirit to make "the Easter event of Christ present with the eschatological destiny of creation in mind".[I.B.II,34.] For man, God is destiny, goal. The possibility of reaching the goal was given once in Jesus and this possibility must be linked to us and to our future. For Congar it is the Holy Spirit who provides the link between what was given in Christ and what is always new in history and in each individual. The Spirit is the one who makes all things new, the one who makes the Paschal event our event, who bears creation onwards to its eschatological destiny. The Spirit is the Spirit of truth and the Spirit of freedom (Jn.14,17: 2 Cor.3,17) and is therefore the one who forms the bond between the truth once set forth in Christ and the newness and unexpectedness of its proclamation and fruition throughout time and space. Because truth is an eschatological reality the point of reference is the Kingdom of God, the object of hope, rather than any kind

of dogma, for all such are in a sense provisional.[I.B.II,34.] The Church is an open structure co-instituted by the Word and the Spirit, the form and the breath of life. God has given everything in Christ yet " there is also something new and something takes place in history." [ibid.p.35.]

The Spirit, however, is the Spirit of Christ and all that he does points to Christ. So although history is, in a sense, open to the future and newness of life, there is nothing that the Spirit can bring that is not of Christ. The Word and the Spirit are inseparable. All new initiatives and interpretations in the name of the Spirit must be tested against the revelation of the Word. This is, of course, easier said than done as the struggles of the liberation theologians with the Vatican testify. There can be opposition to prophets because of attachment to the status quo or from dogmatic certainty but, says Congar,

> we do not after all know where the Breath comes from or where it is going. Pentecost ... initiates Christ in the future but that Christ is still Christ. The Spirit displays something that is new in the novelty of history and the variety of cultures, but it is a new thing that comes from the fullness that has been given once for all by God and Christ.[Congar 1986,70.]

Only the Spirit can know what is in men's hearts. We who are called in an age of encounter between many people and religions must be tolerant . We must remember always that it is Christ who is the way but allow the Spirit to bring the new catholicity to maturity, always keeping our pneumatology sound by remembering its essential and necessary reference to Christ. [Congar 1983,II,35.]

Conclusion.

In a sense Congar is saying nothing new. It seems obvious that there is a primary revelation but that each generation makes it its own in its own circumstances. It is not so simple in practice as centuries of experience show. It is, only through prayer and meditation that one can be sure of keeping the balance between the new and the eternal. Activity should not blind one to this nor should the academic researches necessary for the theologian. All around us there is a climate of thought which decries the possibility of objective truth and there is a tendency either to retreat to a fundamentalist base or to surrender to the seduction of relativism. Holiness and discipline are necessary if one is to keep faith with the past and yet be open to the initiatives of the

Spirit, submitting to the judgement of the Gospel but not being closed to the truths with which we may be meeting in science, philosophy and culture. It has taken till the end of the twentieth century for the Roman Catholic Church to accept officially that Galileo was correct. Pope John Paul II in an address on June 1, 1988 rejected the position of either conflict or separation between religion and science in favour of one of dialogue and interaction encouraging theologians to look at and use scientific methodologies and the philosophy of science. [Russell, Stoeger and Coyne ed, 1988]

To-day there are new problems posed by new discoveries especially in the biological and behavioural sciences. Each discipline can surely learn from the other. Science can help theology guard against fundamentalism and theology can ensure that science does not forget that there are values other than scientific, or economic, ones. The necessity of reminding those engaged in genetic research of the existence of moral values is almost self-evident. There are bound to be tensions and ambiguities in the human condition but if we can hold to the truth that Christ is drawing all creation to himself and that there will be a final restoration of all, we can in the Church surely be tolerant of diverse interpretations of the presence of the Spirit at work. This is applicable in connection with the freedom of the work of the academic theologian. Theologians work by propounding theses and testing them. This entails the possibility of error but that should not mean that their work is restricted. The Church teaches in two ways, through the Pope and the Bishops, and through the theologians, who within a general acceptance of Catholic teaching, including that of the magisterium, may raise critical or creative questions. "Bishops teach with authority to bind in the name of Christ; theologians teach in an academic, non-authoritative way." [Dulles 1992,171]. Congar has shown in practice how a critical theologian can stay within the bounds of the Church.

4. Charismatic Renewal.

Any theological discussion centring on the Holy Spirit must take account of the phenomenon known as Charismatic Renewal. It is a movement, sometimes called or related to neo- Pentecostalism or the Pentecostal movement, which seems to have great promise but which also raises problems and sometimes creates division within the Church.

Charismatic Renewal has been a feature in Protestant Churches since 1956 and in the Roman Catholic Church since 1967. It is not a uniform phenomenon but has taken place within the Christian faith and framework, each tradition remaining true to itself and interpreting the Spirit-awakening in the light of and within the context of its own theology. Each church, as it were, renews itself charismatically. (In this it differs from classic Pentecostalism, an earlier Spiritual movement which began in the U.S.A. at the beginning of this century and which developed as a church in its own right.) It is not so much doctrine and theology as praxis which distinguishes the Charismatic Renewal as a movement or specific group within the Churches. It is essentially a prayer movement, consisting of the formation of prayer groups characterised by individual worship within a community context, that is, everyone is free to pray and praise on his or her own and as he or she wishes, and then that prayer is taken up by all. The form of the prayer is often aloud and it does not take any particular liturgical form. This is unusual in the Roman Catholic Church where public prayer is usually of a ritual nature following a set text and private prayer is usually silent. Its origin seems to have been spontaneous and central to it is witness to an experience of the Spirit revealing Christ. This is a transforming experience - often designated as baptism in the Spirit - which brings a new awareness of the power and the love of God and of the presence of Jesus as Living Lord in the life of the individual. Those who experience it claim that it brings a newness of life, joy and freedom including the desire and the decision to live according to the rule of the living Lord in the power of the Spirit. This spiritual experience is often accompanied by the presence of spectacular charisms such as speaking in tongues, which is sometimes claimed to be the proof of baptism in the Spirit, prophecy and healings.

Congar's interest in the Renewal is from an ecclesiological point of view - what it signifies for the Church to-day, what questions it asks of it, and what contribution it can make to it.[Congar 1983,II,149.] The Church to-day is seen by him to exist in a post-Christian world in which social structures have been

secularised resulting in religion becoming a purely private affair. There has also been a disintegration of community, an increase in state organisation and in the impersonal character of society. In reaction to this fragmented non-religious culture people seek replacements to fill the spiritual and communal gaps in their lives, replacements such as spiritualism, the occult and we might now add the New Age movement. A changing world has brought with it a changed ecclesiology in the Catholic Church. When temporal society and its structures were aligned or identified with a powerful clerical authority a view of the Church as a perfect hierarchical society, the laity subordinated to the clergy, containing within herself all that was necessary for her own life, fitted well enough with people's thoughts and expectations. Such an ecclesiology has now been superseded. The Second Vatican Council, responding to a movement of re-sourcement - " a rising up of vitality from the source into the present rather than a simple return to the sources of Christian faith, although this also certainly took place." [Congar 1983,II,150] -replaced the old ecclesiology with a view of the Church as mystery, the Sacrament of salvation. The institutional or structural character of the Church still exists but is perceived differently. That aspect is no longer regarded as paramount. So Lumen Gentium can say that the Spirit bestows on the Church gifts "both hierarchical and charismatic." Her "fundamental aspect is what can be called the ontology of grace, based on the sacraments and the free gifts of God." [Congar 1983,II,51.] It is only within a Church built up by this spiritual life that the ordained ministry functions as serving that life and the life of the People of God, priests by baptism. Congar speaks of the people of God all having a place in a network of exchange and contribution indicating that all are understood as sharing in the building of the Church.[1975,78] This will of course have repercussions in that priests and bishops would be expected not only to listen to but also to welcome responses from the laity. For Congar this would be understood as taking place within an ecclesiology in which personal subjects build up a communion-church. This new ecclesiology affords to the people a freedom from constraint, a new possibility of taking responsibility for their spiritual welfare, parallel to the changes in society at large. Congar sites the movement for Charismatic Renewal firmly in this context. It is not a challenge to the institutional Church but an attempt, situated within the Trinitarian faith, to strengthen the supernatural life of the people, to give the charisms a stronger profile and to bring back into the church the idea that the power of God is still present and active and that He can still be manifested in

mighty deeds such as prophecy and healings, spiritual and physical. [Congar 1983,II,151.]
There are, however, questions posed by Charismatic Renewal.

4a. What is meant by the title 'Charismatic'?

Charisms are always connected with grace, perhaps the result of its action. They are usually defined as diverse gifts given to individuals for the benefit of the whole Church body. The meaning may be narrowed down on the basis of 1 Cor. 12,7. to manifestations of the presence of the Spirit, visibly recognisable, and with as their aim, the building up of the body of the Church. An even further narrowing occurs when 'charisms ' come to mean simply the more spectacular forms - tongues, prophecy, miracles, the pneumatika. Congar finds this unfortunate identification in many theologians from Pope Leo XIII down.
Congar himself looks on the charisms from the point of view of the Church. The Church instituted by God through Jesus Christ is not left alone, but is continually being built up "by the gifts (charismata), the services or ministries (diakoniai) and the various energemata or 'ways of working ' to which Paul refers in 1 Cor. 12,4-6." [Congar 1983,II,162] It is because of this belief, that charisms are connected with the whole Church, that Congar is critical of the use if the title 'charismatic movement' for Catholic neo-Pentecostalism. He thinks that it runs the risk of attributing the charisms to a particular group instead of seeing them as something belonging to the whole body of believers. The charismata are " gifts of nature and of grace that are distributed and used by the Spirit kata ten charin for the common good and the building up of the community." [Congar 1983,II,162.] He also says that the prominence given to spectacular charisms means that there is a danger of limiting the perception of charisms to the extra-ordinary, of "allowing the extraordinary and the sensational and, on occasion, out- of - hand enthusiasm over some happenings or other, to lead people to identify charisms with the unusual." [1985a, 81.] It is submitted that he is correct in this. Glossolalia, for example, does not seem to have been very important to the New Testament writers, but it has a high profile in charismatic and Pentecostal circles. At Corinth it was highly regarded by the people but not by Paul who also thought that it had to be controlled. St. Paul also mentions charisms which are much more ordinary - service,(R.12,7) teaching,(R12,7;1Cor.12,28f) exhortation and

consolation(R12,8)

The answer to these criticisms from the movement was to say that the existence of charismatic groups did not mean that other groups were disqualified or excluded any more than the existence of Bible study groups infringed the duty of all to read and study Scripture, and to state that they did not stress extra-ordinary manifestations. Charisms are not goals in themselves but are subservient to true prayer which is union with God, and their presence or absence is not indicative of the presence or absence of a deep spiritual life.[O'Connor 1971, 226-227]

As well as standing behind Paul's criticisms in 1 Corinthians Congar also refuses to identify glossolalia with the groaning of the Spirit in us of which Paul speaks in R.8,26. and which Congar understand as the silent prayer of the indwelling Spirit. This presence could be related to praying or singing in tongues "as long as these...are really gifts of God." The fact that the phenomenon of glossolalia exists in pagan societies and that it seems to psychologists to be something which can in certain cases be induced, must at least raise the possibility that it does not always some from the Holy Spirit.[Greeley 1970,71] A survey by Kilian McDonnell however, concludes that an explanation of glossolalia as pathological is not tenable.[McDonnell 1968, 202.]

If however, the case is doubtful, how do we decide whether the experience is or is not of God? We do it by the exercise of spiritual discernment. There is a long history of this in the Catholic Church and it may be a specific charism or just the general exercising of Christian prudence. The latter can be used in conjunction not only with tongues but also with prophecy and with claims to the miraculous. It is the duty of all believers to make use of it [1 Thess.5,19-22.] and it is part and parcel of the life of any spiritually aware Christian. Perhaps Catholics are more aware of the exercise of discernment because of sacramental confession which encourages not only examination of one's life but also the discussion of problems with another. It is within the framework of Christian discernment that "charismatic discernment " should be considered, if indeed there is such a thing. Congar is not sure but believes that if it does exist it is rare, and indeed his description of it, taken from an article by V.Therrien, a Redemptorist, does indeed seem to grant to an ordinary person, extraordinary power to say whether or not the Spirit has intervened. It is described as

> a source of dynamic knowledge and revelation...instantaneous, spontaneous, gratuitous, confusing, unforeseen and accidental....given to be used in a situation of need.[Congar 1983,II,180-181,Therrien1976,23-24]

Since there must surely be certain objective criteria the charism must partake of everything that is necessary for the wider Christian discernment. According to Congar we would find these criteria in " the Word of God seen as a whole and not simply certain passages of Scripture, the teaching of the Church and the masters of spirituality; the duties of our state; our observance of the commandments; our attitude of obedience." [Congar 1983,II,182] In short does the experience being considered bring us closer to Christ, does it contribute to the quality as our lives as Christians? There is no possibility that we are being touched by the Spirit of God if the experience does not result in the presence of the classic 'fruits of the Spirit' which enable us to love as Christ loved. This is the test for any pneumatological experience, its unity with christology.

Congar still feels that there is substance in his criticism from the point of view of ecclesiology - there are many more elements in the Church than spectacular charisms. It is submitted that this may be true in theory but that in practice the insistence on charisms by many in the Renewal poses no serious threat. There does not seem to be evidence of any widespread desire to challenge the institution of the Church and replace the authority of the bishops with a charismatic leadership. Indeed experience of the charismatic movement suggests a very conservative adherence to the status quo .

The greater danger is perhaps to the individuals concerned, in themselves and in their relations with others, the latter in the sense that a certain exclusivity is sometimes claimed and this can lead to dissension within communities. Reliance on the stimulation of the miraculous or quasi-miraculous in prayer seems to suggest a concentration on self rather than on God, to work against a detachment from the worldly. It should not matter, because it is irrelevant, that we do not always, or often feel good or experience manifestations of the Presence of the Lord when we pray. Congar notes this saying that the spiritual leaders of East and West have always warned against seeking the marvellous experiences that the Spirit can provide. Scripture associates sharing in the cross of Christ with sharing in his glory and he quotes Simeon the New Theologian

> May those who do not have continuously to suffer hardship, violence, tribulation and distress in their hearts not tell us 'We have the Holy Spirit within us' because no-one will obtain that reward without the works, the pain, the hardship and the suffering of virtue. [Congar 1983,II,121.]

It is submitted that the approach mentioned presents a particular danger at the present time because the provision of immediate fulfilment is what our society wants. The demand for instant religious satisfaction goes along with the distaste for effort as a prelude to gratification in other spheres and will lead to the same abandonment of the enterprise when the expected results are not forthcoming. This kind of approach to spirituality does no-one any favours. It raises unrealistic expectations and runs counter to the whole idea of taking up the cross and following Christ. It is an attempt to by-pass the reality of this world and the human condition. A search for meaning to existence in some kind of experiential 'trip' which does not include the acceptance of all that is human, sad, painful, good and bad, and its re-interpretation as meaningful in the light of Christ, is doomed to failure and in addition is a betrayal of our very nature. It is not a matter of denying the existence and in some sense the personal importance of experience in prayer, but rather to assert very strongly that to see this as being the purpose of prayer or as something to be sought and expected is quite wrong.

Congar himself discusses whether the charismatic movement is linked to a theology of immediacy, the desire for a quick solution which cuts out difficulties in dealing with problems. He quotes the Protestant theologian Gerard Deltiel as seeing the charismatic form of expression being linked to

> an immediacy of the Word grasped via the text, an immediacy of God's presence grasped through experience, an immediacy of relationship expressed by speaking in tongues and an immediacy that by-passes history. [Congar 1983,II165]

Congar sees the necessity of continued use of the human, rational resources God has given to us and perceives a tendency to anti-intellectualism in the movement with regard to the reading of Scripture, for example. Of course there is an important role for the spiritual reading of Scripture, but he points

out that intellectual effort has a part to play also. Naive fundamentalism is to be avoided. For his part " the idea of being handed a pat, personal solution on a plate without lengthy and laborious research to back it up would leave him very insecure indeed." [Congar 1985a,82.]

One other danger of 'immediacy' is the lessening of social commitment because one concentrates so much on the relationship with God that the relationship with one's neighbour is forgotten. It is not enough to pray while standing apart from a suffering world. This would be a criticism raised by liberation theologians. For example Raul Vidales says according to Congar, that if religious practice perpetuates a mythical, a-historical consciousness it sacralizes the status quo even where this is malign.[Congar 1983, II,172,n.24] Congar quotes a letter which he received claiming that in the Dominican Republic where the Charismatic movement was strongest the social programmes had faded most. He, however, while recognising the dangers thus pointed out, would not accept a theological position which reduced the Gospel message to the necessity of winning political liberation. [Congar 1983,II,169.] The members of the Renewal would deny that their religious orientation turns them away from good works stressing their involvement with trade unionism and politics and would say indeed that it makes their secular work more, not less fruitful.

4b What is meant by "baptism in the Spirit."

The existence of a 'baptism in the Holy Spirit' occurring after sacramental baptism, in which the fullness of the Holy Spirit is given, is a central doctrine in the Pentecostal movement. The term is also sometimes used in the Catholic Charismatic Renewal movement, though terms such as 'outpouring of the Spirit' or 'renewal in the Spirit ' are often used instead.

In Pentecostalism it is held that people have a distinct experience of receiving the Spirit, different from the conversion and water baptism which constitute initiation into the Christian Church, and which some believe is evidenced by speaking in tongues. The position of the established Pentecostal churches is not that the Spirit is received thus for the first time. It is a second (or for some a third) stage in the Christian life. The experience is seen to be a renewal of the experience of the disciples at Pentecost and in the early Church. The trouble is that a strong emphasis on a 'spirit-baptism' accompanied by a transforming experience tends to rob water-conversion baptism of its

meaning.

Is there any true Scriptural warrant for the existence of some 'baptism in the Spirit' distinct from sacramental baptism? Simon Tugwell does not think that there is . The normal time for a person to receive the Spirit was when he became part of the Christian community - it is the presence of the Spirit that makes a person part of the community - and in the New Testament it is by baptism that one enters the community.(Acts 2,38: R.6,3f.] For Paul baptism is into the death and Resurrection of Jesus accomplished by our faith in the name of Jesus, which leads to baptism, and the giving of the Spirit by God. In John 3,5 the joint principles of water and Spirit lead to re-birth. Water baptism and the action of the Spirit are connected in 1Cor.6,11, Tit.3,5.[Tugwell,1972, 268-281.]

What of the Ephesians in Acts 19,1-7? The very fact that Paul had to ask if they had been baptised when he saw that there were no signs of the Spirit's presence among them indicates that he associated the gift of the Spirit with baptism. It turns out that they had not in fact received full Christian initiation.

However Acts also gives instances where the gift of the Spirit did not follow on baptism - the case of the Samaritans who had to have it given to them by the laying on of hands by Peter and John, and the case of Cornelius where the gift of the Spirit preceded water baptism. The latter is explicable as the direct intervention of God in order to initiate a new stage in the plan of conversion and expansion of the Church. The former, according to Tugwell is pointing to an abnormality. Baptism should bring the Spirit. When it does not something has gone wrong. J.D.G. Dunn thinks that the Samaritans did not have real faith in Christ and so the Spirit did not come. [Dunn 1970,Ch.9] Congar does not agree with this interpretation but sees the incident as a marginal and uncertain case, with the suggestion, however, that the coming of the apostles has to do with a desire to maintain the apostolicity of the Church which began in Jerusalem at Pentecost. [Congar 1983,199,n.19.] This is the position taken by Lampe also - that Luke wanted to stress the connection between Jerusalem and Samaria.

The Catholic Charismatic movement in its early stages supported the two-stage idea and perhaps some members still do, but a different theological interpretation of the Spirit experience soon developed. Congar accepts the testimony that many give to receiving the Spirit in a special way through participation in charismatic prayer meetings. He says he believes that though perhaps the term Spirit baptism is used a little too facilely, there is no

intention of disputing the fact that there is only one baptism in the name of Jesus and that this baptism communicates the Spirit. In support of this as being the position adopted by the Renewal he quotes K. and D. Ranaghan

> Baptism in the Holy Spirit is not something replacing baptism and confirmation. Rather it may be seen as an adult re-affirmation and renewal of these sacraments, an opening of ourselves to all their sacramental graces. [Ranaghan1969,20]

The position set out by the Ranaghans is basically the same as that adopted at the international meeting to discuss guidelines for the Renewal movement. The conference, at Malines, Belgium in 1974 adopted the suggestion of Kilian McDonnell that theologically Spirit-baptism was the reception of the Spirit in baptism, but that there could be an **experiential** coming-to-be-aware of the Spirit already present within the individual. This could happen suddenly or could be something which grew gradually as the person progressed in Christian life. It could be said against this view that an awakening of something already within is not what charismatics seem to experience. They seem to experience a coming of the Spirit rather than a release of a dormant Spirit, and yet this type of approach, the coming of the Spirit on the already sanctified in order to perfect them, is more characteristic of heterodoxy than of orthodoxy.

Congar though he is seen to accept a sacramental interpretation of Spirit baptism by his quotation of Ranaghan, - it is a renewal of the sacrament - actually finds its theological justification in his theology of the 'divine missions.' [Congar 1983,II,198.] He simply states this but it looks as if he sees 'Spirit baptism' as not just experientially but theologically a real reception of the Spirit distinct from the reception of the Spirit in baptism. As Congar understands it, the notion of 'mission' connects God as the One who sends and the individual as the one who receives, with the one sent - the Son or the Spirit. The 'sending'can be visible or invisible and can be an entirely new event or a coming in a new way of one already present because 'mission' does not imply movement but the establishment of new relationship. The case for applying this kind of language to the charismatic reception of the Spirit *is* based on Aquinas's assertion that " an invisible mission takes place in accordance with a growth in virtue or an increase in grace....as, for example when [the individual] is raised to the grace of miracles or prophecy." (S.T Ia

q.43 a.6) Since however this new mission is not from outside the individual but from the indwelling Spirit it is not such a very different theology from that of a conscious awakening experience of the Spirit. However Congar's approach does seem to indicate that there could be lots of such comings of the Spirit. This is fine for most people's experience of the spiritual life, but it doesn't seem to fit very well with the charismatic claim to a special transforming experience.

Congar himself does not belong to the Renewal Movement although he believes he lives according to the Holy Spirit. [Congar 1985a, 81.] He sees the difficulties it raises but is very balanced and on the whole sympathetic in his assessment of it. He sees it as a gift of God's grace for the world to-day which has a place in the modern church. He thinks it is a sign that God wants the Church to remember that it is He, through His Spirit, who inspires the building up of the Church. Without criticising an institution which he loves, he sees the Renewal as a reminder of the importance of the personal initiative in the Church, and thinks it is marvellous to see people who " through the coming of the Spirit, rally in various ways to the cause of Jesus Christ, the living Lord." [Congar 1985a,83.] He does however, couple his praise with the admonition that the spontaneous must be coupled with the institutional, just as the work of the Son is linked with that of the Spirit as together they build the ecclesial body of Christ. So

> If any charismatic renewal is to be sound it must embody the Word of God, truth and doctrine. But a doctrinal statement bereft of the Breath is a dead letter. And to claim as coming from the Spirit a stimulus devoid of doctrinal content can lead to illusions , anarchy and dangerous illuminism.[Congar 1985a,84.]

Conclusion

In his approach to the Renewal movement Congar seeks to maintain balance between the God-given element in the Church (its structure in the sense of all that is 'given' - deposit of faith, sacraments, ministries) and the historical reality of individual response to the Spirit which is the Renewal. All Spirit-centred revival movements tend towards an imbalance weighted against the institutional or structural church and this is why Congar puts his questions to the Renewal in the name of ecclesiology. Congar, however, was one of the theologians who helped move ecclesiology on from the incarnational model

which tended to see the Church as 'Christ continued' , too closely linking it with the physical body of Jesus Christ. Paul's 'Body of Christ' is his risen, Spirit-filled Body and Congar has helped to bring about acknowledgement that the Church has a pneumatological as well as a christological foundation. This being so, it is clear that the Holy Spirit belongs to the very being of the church. The Spirit is given to the community and to the individual persons who make up the Church seen as a communion. It is within this understanding of Church that the multiplicity of charisms can be seen to build towards a substantial unity, and it is only within a Church so understood that the danger of dissent in name of the Spirit can be avoided. Congar's part in the development of a theology of the church as communion has helped his church to receive the new wine of the Charismatic Renewal without breaking apart. His refusal to limit the charisms to any one group affirms that all members of the Church have gifts which can be used for her growth and development.[Congar 1974b]

The hierarchical church must develop more fully this theology with its pneumatological element, pay more than lip service to the message that in Christ all are equal. The theological basis is there for a praxis which would make all who at present feel marginalised, especially women, the poor and the oppressed, believe that their existence and their gifts are recognised as valuable and indispensable, not to be suppressed by a rigid institutionalism. While the Charismatic Renewal movement can be incorporated within the Church as it stands, without further progress in opening up the whole Church to the insights which modern pneumatological research has brought, no major progress will come about. Because it calls for such self-discipline, it is difficult for many to avoid the dangers of elitism and the search for gratification to which the movement is prone, and there is no doubt that charismatic groups have caused much dissension within congregations. Yet the church is only Church in fullness in the totality of the gifts of all. As a Church made by the Spirit as well as by the Word she is to be perceived not as a ready-made society but as a dynamic reality being made by God . We have therefore the vision of the Church coming vertically from the action of God and horizontally from the gifts of God in the faithful. The latter however, is only the manifestation of the generosity of the former in the freedom of the Spirit. Congar avoids any problems of divisiveness by saying that what is needed is that the Church itself, rather than an element within it, should renew itself charismatically.

Congar's mature vision is of a Church truly made by the Son and the Spirit in that the spiritual, the charismatic enables it " to go beyond itself" [Congar 1983,II,130] By this he means that in the freedom of the Spirit the Church must make use of the gifts of all, clerical and lay, who are themselves free in the Spirit, to ensure that rigid historical and cultural forms do not bind, to ensure that she understands herself as more than institution so that new and perhaps surprising developments may be welcomed. In such a Church it may well emerge that she is meant to be more than was ever thought in the past. [cf Rahner,1979,73]

Congar, for all his insistence on and love for the institutional Church, comes finally by his increasing reliance on the importance of the Spirit, to insist that the Church which he loves is " also and even primarily, the 'we' of Christians."[Congar 1983,II,130]

4c The Renewal and Ecumenism.

Yves Congar is recognised as an ecclesiologist particularly interested in ecumenism. In the preface to Chretiens en Dialogue he gives an account of his interest in and work with the ecumenical movement and re-affirms the views expressed in Chrétiens Désunis saying that

> the essential ecumenical activity of the Catholic Church should be to live its own life more fully and genuinely; to purify itself as much as possible, to grow in faithfulness, in good works, in depth of prayer and in union with God. In being fully herself in the full strength of her vigour, she will develop her ecumenical power.[Congar 1964,31.]

If Charismatic Renewal is one way of the Spirit working to bring people to Christ, the Church learning to live her Christian commitment more fully and to strive for the unity of all in Christ, the ecumenical movement is another aspect of the same aim. More particularly, Charismatic Renewal is linked with ecumenism because it has been the occasion for people of different denominations to come together to pray. Such ecumenical gatherings must be a good thing because they come from a genuine desire to draw closer to God and to grow in union with Him. However, Cardinal Suenens, appointed by Pope Paul V1 to monitor the Charismatic movement in the Catholic Church, was aware of possible difficulties.

> It would be wrong to succumb to a euphoric state of ecumenism and, in the warmth of newly discovered brotherhood, forget the doctrinal problems that have not yet been solved - the definition of the place and the significance of the sacramental structures and the part played by man in those structures when we speak of the activity of the Spirit; talk of faith without defining what it contains and means; failure to define a common faith in the Eucharist and the function of the one who presides at the Lord's Supper... [Suenens1978,]

In other words we have to deal with the paradox of diversity in unity and face up to the fact that we recognise each others Churches up to a point but no further. One is reminded of this when present at a service welcoming into the community those who are being prepared for membership of the Roman

Catholic Church. In days gone by they would have received at least conditional baptism but now, since the Churches mutually accept each others baptism, the individuals were welcomed as Christians who, after a further time of preparation, would be confirmed and only then enter into full Eucharistic communion. A recognition of the other Churches baptism does not mean that the Roman Catholic church allows full Eucharistic fellowship.

This sets up the framework. Pray together by all means but remember that unity has not thereby been achieved. Congar quotes the directives for the way forward based on the work of Heribert Mühlen and adopted by the Third European Charismatic Leaders conference in 1975. These can be summarised thus:

1. Each Church has its own spiritual tradition and not all the gifts of grace are complete in each one. So each should ask what inalienable vocation it has preserved from its historical origin.

2.Each Church should be open to recognising the gifts of grace in the other churches and to being enriched by them. Each should then examine if it has made its own gifts absolute and to what extent it is responsible for the division of the one Church of Christ.

3.Each church, on the basis of its own inalienable vocation, and a critical evaluation, must ask what it can accept of what the other Churches offer. Each should push its receptiveness to the limits because the gifts of grace are for the common good.

Congar, while basically in agreement with what is said and conscious that this is what is in fact happening, believes that there are ecclesiological questions to be asked about which the statement does not speak. He feels that it sounds as if there were no ecclesiological truth and yet different ecclesiologies are implied in the words " what inalienable vocation it has preserved from its historical origin." It is certainly necessary to examine critically the historical forms because these have often played a part in causing division, but an important core of ecclesiological truth will be found. He does not think, therefore, that one can speak of a diversity of gifts in the churches as if the universal Church was made up of divided churches each with its own gifts in the same way that a community of Christians is made up of different individuals, each with his or her own gifts, coming together to build up the community, each serving in his or her own way. Congar explains how Cullman has tried to apply the theme of charisms to the Catholic and Protestant churches. The charism of the former is the search for universalism

while that of the latter is to stress the purity of concentration on Christ. Together, if in undistorted form, they can help maintain a balance, and so the churches should work in harmony, each developing its own charism, purifying it and ever taking it to deeper levels. He also quotes Jean-Miguel Garrigues who concentrates on the fact that Charismatics experience together the same mystery of Christ though they come from different denominations. Congar is not happy to accept this uncritically. Yes, there is a unity of experience among those who pray together and experience the living Spirit together. This however, is a different kind of unity from that sought by the ecumenical movement. It does not eradicate the divisions between the churches. It either ignores or goes round them. He very firmly believes that the Church is made not by Christ alone, nor by the Spirit alone, but by Word and Spirit acting together. Just as too one-sided a reliance on the Christological leads to a rigid juridical ecclesiology, so an equally distorted ecclesiology will result if we try to ignore the institutional elements introduced into the Church by Christ and the means of grace thereby given, and try to set up a 'church of the Spirit' based on the warmth of experience fraternally shared. There have in the past been ecclesiologies which laid so much emphasis on the inner life and the fruits of the Spirit that the visible means of salvation were all but ignored.

> The Church is not simply communion in and through the Spirit - it is also a sacrament. It is also the word and the confession of faith. It is the celebration of the Eucharist and the other sacraments. It is a community and it is ministries. It is a personal and communal discipline. In all these respects we are not yet united.[Congar 1983,II, 207.]

Congar has done much to help the ecumenical movement with insights which have helped to move the Catholic church away from an entrenched, rigid ecclesiology, to encourage her to examine her own structures and admit the possibility that mistakes might have been made, and to be open to the virtues of the other churches. He has often made use of the dialectic of structure and life in order to do this, and we could say that in this area of the Renewal and ecumenism he sees the unity which the Charismatics claim as being a unity of the life pole while division still exists at the level of the structure of the churches. This is true, but is it necessary that there should be absolute conformity in order that all may be one? One might suggest that this makes

the church too important, more so than God's Word and Spirit, but for Congar as for Irenaeus(Adv. haer.III,24) God's Spirit and God's Church are always present together.

Congar's treatment of the Renewal movement in all its dimensions confirms his pneumatological emphasis on the Church as a communion, a living reality built up by the contributions of all its members, no longer to be defined in terms of the ministerial priesthood acting upon the laity, regarded almost as 'clients', in social work jargon. This is not to say that the ordained ministry is unnecessary, but rather to bind us to the view that all theological interpretation must be Trinitarian. All proceeds ultimately from the Father who sent forth His Word and His Spirit; that which comes from Christ and that which comes from the Spirit must be considered as a unity, both being necessary for completion..

5. The Holy Spirit and the Sacraments.

In Catholic theology the notion of sacrament includes the concept of sign together with a reality of presence of what is signified; it is an efficacious sign, an indication of the presence of grace. There is a coming-to-presence of a spiritual reality. For Congar this action derives from the two hands of God, that is it is a work in which both Christ and the Spirit are involved. [Congar 1986,34.]

Traditionally the sacraments have been associated with the Incarnation, the quintessential sacrament or sign of God's grace. Avery Dulles says that " just as in the Incarnation the Word was made flesh, so in the sacraments the prescribed word becomes embodied in the elements, the gestures, the persons." [Dulles1987,113.] Sacrament is more than word for Congar also. He says that he wants to add to Rahner's perception that sacraments are the word at its highest level, the idea that the sacramental act adds an original value, " that of physical contact that is open to man's senses, the result of contact with Jesus humanity." [Congar 1986,34.]

The action of the Holy Spirit is also needed. and Congar believes that this pneumatological dimension is beginning to be re-discovered.[Congar1973,24.] There is a sign-structure to a sacrament which presents as an objective reality but one which brings about a spiritual effect and this not simply because of its Christological structure and derivation but by the action of the Holy Spirit.

> It is the Holy Spirit who makes the work of Christ present in the time of the Church...it is the Holy Spirit who gives time, which he permeates and dominates, that special quality which makes it sacramental time in which the commemoration of the past makes it present, active and effective with the absolute future in view.[Congar 1986,35.]

This reference picks up Congar's understanding of the Spirit as associated with the eschaton, as Lord of history and as the presence of God in history; one and the same Spirit who is present in Jesus as principle of sanctification, performs a similar function in the individual.

Congar is particularly interested in the sacraments of initiation, Baptism, Confirmation and the Eucharist, which bring about the process whereby the human being lives no longer 'according to the flesh' but 'according to the

Spirit' as an adopted child of God.

5a. Baptism and Confirmation.

Congar is particularly interested in the sacraments of initiation, Baptism and Confirmation, which bring about the process whereby the human being lives no longer 'according to the flesh' but 'according to the Spirit' as an adopted child of God. There is a close relationship between these two sacraments but there are difficulties involved also. There is Scriptural evidence aplenty that Baptism itself confers the Spirit, and, according to Congar, Christian antiquity also testifies to a unique process of sacramental rites bringing about Christian initiation.[Congar 1973,25] Yet there has been the development of two sacraments, or two stages in the process, Baptism with water and anointing with oil, and Confirmation, conferred by the anointing with chrism and the laying on of hands, accompanied by the words, " Receive the seal of the gift of the Holy Spirit." This separation into two sacraments suggests that there is a 'seal of the Spirit' which is different from the gift of the Spirit in Baptism, without which Christian initiation is incomplete. The theoretical difficulty is manifested in the pastoral situation where there are differences of opinion as to the age when Confirmation should be given, and some unease about what is actually happening?

One answer which Congar considers is that Confirmation originates an increase in grace. Strength is given to " quicken the Christian's endeavour" and to enable him or her to undertake more confidently the task of the Christian within society.[Congar 1973,25.] St. Thomas, Congar says connects this sacrament with that stage of life when the child begins to communicate with others outside the immediate family, to feel part of a wider society to which people contribute both in the secular sphere and within the Church. Congar finds this interesting and relates it to modern findings in the psychology of child development.

One must however go beyond this approach which is basically concerned with anthropology and the individual Christian life. There is also an ecclesial dimension to the sacrament. Congar finds this in W. Breuning who, he says, sees Baptism as entry into the paschal life of Christ and Confirmation as insertion into the history or construction of the Church inaugurated at Pentecost. The individual is placed within " the concrete fellowship of the Apostles. " Breuning is joining together the christological and

pneumatological 'moments' of the sacraments just as Cyril of Jerusalem related the two sacramental moments of initiation to the two aspects of Jesus' baptism, immersion in water and anointing by the Spirit.[Congar 1973, 26]

Heribert Muhlen, Congar says, takes a similar approach, relating Confirmation to the historic future of the Church. It is " the sacrament that inserts the candidate into the apostolic continuity of the Church throughout her history." [ibid n.33.]

Congar as an ecclesiologist favours the approach which understands Confirmation as the sacrament which incorporates baptised persons into the apostolic community of the Church. While he would not try to ground the sacrament in Acts 8, 11-17 - the story of the Samaritans who were baptised by Philip and on whom Peter and John laid hands - or on Acts 19,1-7 where those who had apparently been baptised when they believed but had not received the Holy Spirit - he accords these episodes an ecclesiological significance. The disciples became full members of the Church when they were publicly accepted by the bearers of Christ's apostolicity. He connects the Western reservation of the sacrament to the bishop with this aspect also. [Congar 1983,III,220.]

While it is true that both these episodes teach that the gift of the Spirit is associated with the apostolic community as witness to the continued presence of the Risen Lord, it is submitted that they are not helpful in explaining what specifically happens in Confirmation after the Spirit has without doubt already been given by sacramental baptism within the community of the Church.

In addition to these ecclesiological explanations there are those which make use of analogical relationships. Baptism is related to Christ in his Pasch while Confirmation is analogous to Pentecost. The two are closely connected being the christological and pneumatological aspects of the same mystery; Baptism draws us into Christ's death (R.6,3-4) while Confirmation means life through the Spirit whose sending is the first fruit of the Paschal mystery. Congar refers to the development of these analogies by L.S.Thornton and J.Lecuyer and says that both also refer to the two missions of the Spirit, at the Incarnation and at the Baptism of Jesus, the former making him exist as Word of God and Son of Mary and the latter bringing about his existence as the anointed one, the Christ. In the same way, in baptism we are born as children of God while Confirmation allows us to participate in Christ's messianic anointing. [Congar 1983,III,219.]

As we have seen, these two missions figure in Congar's understanding of the

Christ event, but he does not specifically endorse the above. He certainly believes that the problem of the relationship between baptism and confirmation can only be solved at the theological level. The mystery of our deification involves both the Word and the Spirit and it is a question of translating the events of the Economy, which include the two missions of Word and Spirit, in the process of Christian initiation. [Congar 1973,27.] What he does say that he has believed for a long time that baptism and confirmation " are an expression, at the level of liturgical symbolism of the double mission of the incarnate Word and the Spirit."[Congar 1983,III,222.]

So the liturgy echoes saving events, the descent of the Word, the sanctification of the Spirit, the baptism in the Jordan, the descent of the Sprit. There is but one process of Christian initiation, Baptism with water and the Spirit, but there developed a symbolic 'sealing' with the Spirit, distinguished from baptism, which Congar believes is the liturgical way of expressing that salvation is the work of both Word and Spirit.

This is as acceptable an explanation of the existing situation as others for none seems to give a good theological reason for the separation of the two aspects of initiation . It seems to be a case of trying to find theoretical justification for something which happened perhaps for other reasons.

John Zizioulas relate the Baptism/Confirmation problem to difficulties with the priority of christology or pneumatology, whether the Spirit is involved in the being of Christ or whether there is no Spirit till Christ is raised. So the Syrian tradition till the fourth century, in which Confirmation preceded Baptism, points to the priority of pneumatology, whereas the separation of the two acts in the West with Baptism happening first, indicated a christocentric approach. He says that since there is evidence that the two actions were linked in the early Church there need not be a problem over priority as long as both the christological and pneumatological elements are present.[Zizioulas 1985,127-129] The Eastern Church gives both sacraments and the Eucharist to infants.

From a practical or pastoral point of view it is easy to understand the desire for a marking of adult acceptance of what took place in infant baptism. Western practice, which used to confirm at about the time of first communion, now seems to have settled on the age of eleven or twelve for the sacrament of confirmation, and this seems to be too early for a genuine adult commitment. This is Congar's view also. [Congar 1983,III,224.]

5b. Eucharist.

The Eucharist also raises questions concerning the relationship of the Word and the Spirit. There have grown up in the Churches of East and West different interpretations of the liturgical celebration of this sacrament whose purpose is to make effective at any particular time what God has done once and for all for us in Christ. The Eastern approach focuses on the work of the Holy Spirit, invoked by the celebrant, in bringing about this effectiveness while that of the West has tended to concentrate on the words of institution. The problem may be posed either in terms of the determination of the exact moment of consecration, or in terms of the identification of the agent of that consecration, the priest as representative of Christ efficaciously repeating his words, or the Holy Spirit invoked in the epiclesis. For Congar this is the wrong way of approaching the problem and one which leads to controversy.[Congar 1983,III,228.]

The East/West controversy began relatively late following, as it does, on a thousand year period when both Churches made use of the epiclesis and commonly attributed the change in the gifts of bread and wine to the Holy Spirit. Congar explains that the epiclesis cannot be separated from the whole anaphora, the complete Eucharistic prayer, and says that the diverse formulations have but one common purpose, to extend to the members of the Body of Christ, the salvation and deification he gained for them by his death, his Resurrection and glorification through the Spirit, and finally the gift of Pentecost. [Congar 1983,III,229.] This purpose is seen in the analogy, even continuity, between the Incarnation and the Eucharist, expressed in the Eucharistic prayer, for example by Irenaeus (Adv. Haer.IV,18,5 & V 2,2) and the connection of the epiclesis with the anamnesis seen in the Apostolic Tradition of Hippolytus "Mindful of his death and resurrection we offer you this bread and wine...and we ask you to send your Spirit upon the offering of your holy Church."

In other words, if we look at the Eucharistic prayer as a whole we see both Christological and pneumatological elements. In addition, Congar says that it is not possible to separate an epiclesis for the consecration of the gifts and one which asks for the sanctification of those present. While Congar is willing to acknowledge that the rise of Scholasticism in the West led to a concentration on one aspect of the Eucharist, the words of institution, he also cites many instances which show that the West was always convinced not only of the

consecratory function of the words of institution, but also of the part played by the Holy Spirit. [Congar 1983,III,250-253.]

Whatever the cause (and Congar suggests the desire to know the exact moment of consecration, which stemmed from the principle which stated that the transubstantiation or change had to be instantaneous) the result was a move away from seeing the anaphora as a unity, the whole of which was involved in the application of the benefits of Christ's consecration at the Last Supper, to a particular Eucharist at a particular time. It also resulted in a very Christological conception of the Eucharist; the priest acting in persona Christi, enacts the transformation of the elements immediately and simply by pronouncing, with intent, the words of institution. Such an insistence on the causality of the words of consecration focuses attention on the function of the priest. In addition the absence of an epiclesis in the Roman canon contributed to the concentration on this aspect and also contributed to the lack of development of the pneumatological aspect.

This is a notion unacceptable to the East. Congar quotes Evdokimov as saying that the idea of " in persona Christi, which identifies the priest with Christ, is absolutely unknown. Indeed it is unthinkable. For them {the Greeks} the priest invokes the Holy Spirit precisely in order that the words of Christ, reproduced and cited by the priest, acquire all the effectiveness of the speech-act of God." [Congar 1983,III,236.]

Congar tries to open the way to dialogue between the two traditions by saying that though the West may have been to blame for causing misunderstanding, such statements as "sacerdos alter Christus" have to be understood in their true sense, which is spiritual and functional, not ontological and juridical.[ibid.]

It may be that the priesthood is now coming to be seen more in these terms, but there is no doubt that there has been a strain in Roman Catholicism which very much stressed the ontological and juridical aspects. This can be seen in the present disinclination of Rome to grant laicisation to priests who wish to leave.

Congar puts forward the view that the priest is only in persona Christi in the sense that he is a 'sacramental reality' i.e. he represents the spiritual reality that when the Church worships, Christ is there as the Head, together with the members if his mystical body; both Christ and the ecclesia are visibly represented by the priest acting for both. "He acts in persona Christi and in persona ecclesia. One of these aspects cannot be isolated from the other - the one is contained within the other." [Congar 1983,III,235.]

The Western Christological emphasis has led to the 'in persona ecclesiae' being interpreted within the 'in persona Christi' which is seen as the basis and reason for the former. It is submitted that this can be seen if we look at the encyclical Mediator Dei, [20th. Nov. 1947] which, condemning those who teach that priesthood means only the priesthood of all the baptised, says that the priest acts for the people only because he bears the person of Christ. It is not more proper that the priest should celebrate the Eucharist with people present rather than privately. When we look at the Second Vatican Council's document on the priesthood, Presbyterorum Ordinis,(1,2) we find that it speaks first of the priesthood of all believers, in the Body of Christ "all the faithful are made a holy and kingly priesthood" and then goes on to speak of the ordained ministry. Rather than speaking of them as empowered to act 'in persona Christ' it speaks of ordained ministers being sharers in Christ's priesthood in a special way to " act as his ministers who through his Spirit continually exercises his priestly function for our benefit in the liturgy." [ibid 2,5.] This is a step in the right direction though perhaps not quite so directly as in the Eastern Churches which, Congar says, by emphasising the pneumatological aspect situate the 'in persona Christi' more easily within the 'in persona ecclesiae'. For them it is still the case that the priest, and the priest alone has 'power' to celebrate the Eucharist, but it is not a power which 'belongs' to him but one which, by virtue of the grace of God, is operative in him through the Church. [Congar 1983,III,236.]

Indeed the controversy over the epiclesis is not really a problem about sacramental theology i.e. about the form the celebration should take, but rather one of Trinitarian theology and this is why the Eastern Churches feel that it matters so much. The epiclesis is the expression of the theology of the Holy Spirit. The liturgy expresses the economic manifestation of God's Trinity and the communication of its life to us. Therefore to the Orthodox mind to concentrate on the Christological aspect , the words of institution, is to break up the unity of the Eucharistic prayer and to devalue the role of the Spirit. The Orthodox, for their part do not perceive the consecration to take place only through the epiclesis. [Kern, 1951, 181.]

The fact that Congar draws these matters to our attention attests to his own Trinitarian approach to theology, to his desire to ensure that ecclesiology takes a comprehensive approach and is not imprisoned in any particular cul-de-sac. This is in keeping with the growing pneumatological emphasis in his doctrine of the Church. His historical scholarship is evident in the detailed references

he gives to the development of sacramental and liturgical form in the Fathers and theologians of the Church, and the breadth of his vision in the concern which he has that such scholarship should be directed towards reconciliation of different traditions and that this should include looking critically at one's own. It also fits in with his ecumenical interest. He feels that the new Eucharistic prayers which came into use after the Second Vatican Council, and which all contain an epiclesis, before the words of institution asking for the gifts to be sanctified, and one after the consecration asking for the fruits of the sacrament to be bestowed through the Holy Spirit, are important theologically and in ecumenical relations. [Congar 1983,III,241.]

Above all Congar's treatment of the Holy Spirit as working with Christ in the sacramental life of the Church is another instance of his conviction that God works with two hands to bring us to Himself.

All that has been said in this chapter underlines and demonstrates Congar's belief in the presence and power of the Spirit in the Church. God is encountered through His Spirit if the Church and the individual are open to hearing Him. The Spirit is there in the institutional Church, in ministry and sacrament, keeping her true to her origins, the Spirit is there in the charismatic element of the Church encouraging her towards the plenitude intended by God. The Spirit is in the Church but not only in the Church

> We simply do not know the frontiers of the Spirit's activity in this world and the way in which he acts. We can only be sure that they are related to Christ whose spiritual body is formed with men by the Spirit.[Congar 1986,126]

CONCLUSION

CONCLUSION

I began my study of the theology of Yves Congar with the intention of discovering whether he could be said to be a pneumatological theologian. At its simplest this must mean that the work of the theologian in question must be truly Trinitarian; in the Creed we profess belief in Father, Son and Holy Spirit and to forget or underestimate any one of these leads to a distorted faith. Thus a 'pre-Trinitarian' vision of God focusing one-sidedly on the fact that He is wholly transcendent , must be denounced as leading to the deism of a God unconnected with creation. Likewise to concentrate on the Son as God in history not only sidelines the Spirit but downgrades the Father also, a dangerous process which can culminate in a kind of humanism with Jesus as simply a moral leader proclaiming a secular Gospel. In connection with such an approach Congar mentions with astonishment and dismay a collection of prayers produced in Germany which rarely mentions either the Father or the Spirit, this in spite of the fact that the Second Vatican Council worked with a Trinitarian conception of God. [Congar 1973,22.] While the Holy Spirit is the Person of the Trinity most often forgotten there have been attempts at a religion of the Spirit, purely interior, pietistic, which is also far from the truth presented when all the elements are synthesised.

It can be concluded from this study of his theology that Congar ensures that no member of the Godhead is forgotten. In his mature theology, secure in his Trinitarian approach, he can revive Irenaeus's image of the Word and the Spirit as the two hands of God, together doing His work, and can assert the impossibility of separating Christology from Pneumatology. [Congar, 1983, 9: 1986,1]

Congar himself says that he came to the Holy Spirit " by reflection" after having begun with an essentially Paternal vision of God and moving then to a concentration on the Son.[Lauret 1988, 61] The major works on the theme of the Spirit have come at the end of his productive years. I Believe in the Holy Spirit provides such a rich documentation of views on the Spirit through the centuries that sometimes Father Congar's own original understanding does not emerge with sufficient clarity. His habit of presenting his own views by quoting those of others can obscure the personal. He is full of wonder at the richness of the tradition, desirous of presenting the breadth of its history to the modern Christian, but not really drawn to speculative or systematic theology with the result that what we have is the quarry from which the theology can be

mined rather than the completed presentation. His approach to Scripture and the Fathers is positivistic and though he makes reference to the techniques of modern scholarship, in practice not all of these are integral to his theological approach.

His dogmatic theology of the Holy Spirit takes the form of a careful historical survey of the development of that theology, in conjunction with Trinitarian theology, in Scripture and in the experience of the Church, with some indications of which developments are of most interest to him, but he does not provide an original contribution in this area. He does however, provide a secure Trinitarian foundation for his entire theology by ensuring that Scriptural, Traditional and theological evidence for the doctrine of the Spirit is clearly and comprehensively presented. His careful retrieval and presentation of the legacy of the Eastern Churches is also of lasting value especially in connection with ecumenical relations. Congar's concentration on the Scriptural and doctrinal evidence in all its breadth means that he is at least in a position to develop a pneumatology which, rather than simply carrying out an instrumental function in Christology and ecclesiology, actually provides the framework, biblically supported, for both.

This is relevant to that interpretation of what it means to be a pneumatological theologian which envisages such a one providing a full synthesis in which the different areas of theology are considered as a coherent whole, understood in terms of the Spirit. This is the approach of which, Kilian McDonnell tells us, Barth dreamed; a theology in which the Holy Spirit would dominate, in which everything that was said about the Father and the Son, including God's work with his creatures, would be made clear with reference to the Spirit. [McDonnell, 1985, 193]

This is probably the theology of which Congar also dreamed though he made no claim to provide it. Though conscious of the danger of reading more into his theology than he himself intended, my intention has been to show that, considering Congar's work with the possibility of such a theology in mind, we may conclude that he has achieved a step in the direction of bringing unity and coherence to theological understanding by incorporating the Spirit constitutively in the major areas of Christology, Ecclesiology and the relation of humanity to God. It is submitted that he comes to consider the different branches of theology from a new perspective, that of the Spirit, and as a result, in addition to making adjustments to his approach in the individual areas, the whole of theology is brought into a pneumatological , and therefore a truly

Trinitarian, unity.

This position was reached obliquely. Congar's pneumatology has been shown to be, to a large extent, inspired by his ecclesiological interests. His early interest in the work of Moehler was conducive to the incorporation of a pneumatological element in ecclesiology.[supra Chapter 1] His ecumenical interests led him, early in his theological career, to the tradition of the Eastern Churches.[Congar 1964, xxx]While Orthodox pneumatology does not provide all the answers to theological debate about the Holy Spirit in the wider Church, Congar's experience of it widened his vision and acted as a stimulus to his study. He himself has shown, however, that the western Roman Catholic tradition was never '. christo-monistic' in the sense sometimes claimed [Congar, 1970] This is accepted by the Orthodox theologian John Zizioulas. [Zizioulas, 1985, 127.]

Indeed the heart of Congar's theology is his ecclesiology and it is from this centre that his pneumatology has developed rather than from an interest in, and a conviction of the centrality of, pneumatology moving outwards towards ecclesiology, Christology and Trinitarian doctrine. The result of this is that he comes to pneumatology from a position more of redressing the balance than of fundamental re-orientation of theological approach. This is particularly evident in his Christology.

It has been mentioned often above that Congar thinks in terms of revelation being for us, and that one of the motive forces of his approach to theology is to explain the way God works with His creatures. We can expect, therefore, that his Christology will be soteriologically orientated. The New Testament expresses in a variety of ways the fact that the death of Jesus on the cross is for our salvation. It happened but it is more than historical event; it has a significance which is universal, not particular. What a theologian's Christology must do, as best it can, is explain this to succeeding generations. In pursuit of this aim Congar arrives at the necessity of incorporating the Holy Spirit .

When Congar says that if he were to draw one conclusion from his work on the Holy Spirit it would be that there is no Christology without pneumatology, and no pneumatology without Christology, [Congar, 1986, 1] he is not limiting his understanding of the unity of the action of the Second and Third Persons of the Trinity to the doctrine of the person and work of Christ, for he believes that in all areas the Word and the Spirit do God's work together, but he does set out to incorporate a pneumatological element in this particular area

of theology as a way of clarifying what happened for us in the life, death and resurrection of Jesus Christ. His reflections lead him to a pneumatically orientated Christology.

The point of a Spirit Christology is to make God's salvific revelation of Himself in the economy as comprehensible as possible and to ensure that all Scriptural evidence is incorporated. The logic of Congar's approach, it is submitted, begins from his conviction that the meaning of salvation to mankind is paramount. This prompts a departure from the scholastic method as it came down in the theology of the manuals. Neo-Scholasticism in particular, having accessed the data from revelation, concentrated on the 'en-soi' i.e. the immanent Trinity, the doctrine of the person of Christ and the doctrine of grace. It had a static feel. Lost in the detail of theological speculation is the reason for it all. Yet the New Testament 's christological statements are functional, come within the context of salvation history.[cf.Kasper 1989,74]

Congar is also concerned with the fact that God's work takes place in history; the historical working out of it must, then, be important, not simply in the sense that history is the backdrop, but constitutively. From this point of view it is necessary to look beyond the Incarnation of the Word to see the whole historical sweep of salvation history which culminates in the life, death, and Resurrection of Christ and his sending of the Spirit thereafter, as a unity, and one in which not just the Word but the Spirit also is involved at every stage. In addition it is only through the historical signs that we can learn of God and our redemption. Whereas neo-Scholasticism was not concerned with the historical interpretation of revelation, Congar's view is that now Scripture must be read in a more purely biblical and historical way.[Congar 1986, 85] This would lead, for example, to seeing that Jesus must be understood within the context of a biblical pneumatology.

The classical Christology of Aquinas in which Congar was trained, was a descending Christology concentrating on the Incarnation. It has been shown [supra Chapter Four] that he came to feel dissatisfaction with this, not because it was wrong and should be re-placed or because it was unhelpful in modern evangelization, but because he felt it did not give due weight to the historical aspect of the salvation accomplished by Jesus in the course of an authentically human life and did not do full justice to biblical witness in that it concentrates on one interpretation, that of descent, most particularly as expressed in the gospel of John, at the expense of that of re-ascent with which the Holy Spirit

is particularly involved.

Jesus of Nazareth, God made man, is the central point of God's plan or design of grace which is ordered to the restoration of humanity to union with its Creator.[Congar 1966b] It is therefore in the human life of Jesus that one must look for an understanding of man in his relationship with God. Man, however, experiences relationship with God through the Spirit ; both the Old and the New Testaments bear witness to this, that it is through the Spirit that the communication of the divine takes place. If the life of grace has then, a pneumatological dimension, it would seem to follow that it can be connected with the results of the Christ event only if the Spirit is also involved in that event from the very moment it begins, that is at the Incarnation.

The incorporation of the Spirit is Christology is less difficult in the perspective of Eastern theology. Their understanding of the Trinity, concentrating as it does on the hypostatic distinctions of the Persons by means of their relations of origin, lends itself to the distinctness of the missions of the Son and the Spirit. There is less temptation to understand the Spirit's role as simply an adjunct to that of the Son in a sense in which the full weight of the Spirit's contribution to the economy is lost.

In the Western paradigm it is less easy to acknowledge totally that the 'mission' of the Spirit, whether in the Incarnation, in Pentecost or in the life of grace is a 'proper' mission, one peculiarly his own, and this because of the Filioque and the doctrine of appropriation. It has been demonstrated that Congar is sympathetic to Eastern insights and at least goes some way towards a proper mission of the Spirit.[Chapter Five,2] In his Christology, while acknowledging the unity of the actions ad extra of the Trinity, he goes beyond the doctrine of appropriations in speaking of how the events of salvation come about. Each divine Person makes his contribution to the economy according to the characteristic way in which he is divine. Thus only the Son is incarnate. Neither the Father nor the Spirit enters history in this way though they are involved with history. The Christology of Aquinas, being based on a metaphysical understanding of the Incarnation as proceeding from God's 'essence' or nature, has no place for the work of the Spirit except by 'appropriation', and works in terms of created grace. Congar attempts to give the Spirit a more active, or rather a more personal and constitutive, role in the conception of Jesus . It is argued that it is possible to understand him as saying that the role of the Spirit in the Incarnation was to bring about and so sanctify the humanity of Jesus Christ that it became united with the eternal Word/Son.

This involves the Spirit constitutively in the Christ event from the very beginning and makes possible a better understanding of the connection between the characteristics of the Trinitarian persons and their involvement with human salvation.

John Zizioulas holds that a properly pneumatological Christology must take account of the fact that while the Son becomes history, the Spirit liberates the Son and the Economy from history.

> If the Son dies on the cross, thus succumbing to the bondage of historical existence, it is the Spirit that raises him from the dead. The Spirit is the '*beyond*' history and when he acts in history he does so in order to bring into history the last days, the eschaton.[Zizioulas 1985,130.]

In other words the Spirit must be involved in the very being of Jesus if the salvation of Jesus is to be plausibly said to be applicable universally.

Congar does not speak of the Spirit as breaking the power of history to contain, to bind, indeed it is Jesus who is lord of time, opens it up, [Congar 1966,268: 1983,II,33.] He speaks, however, of the Resurrection and the Ascension as

> the very first achievement in the triumph of the Pneuma over nature itself, the reconciliation in Christ of the cosmic order with the order of God's free grace. [Congar (1957 & 65) 1985,66.]

This seems to convey the same meaning. Congar's basic endorsement of Zizioulas's theology of apostolicity, it is argued, confirms that he does intend the Spirit to be involved in the creation of the very being of Christ at the moment of the Incarnation since Zizioulas understands a pneumatically constituted Christ not only after the Resurrection but from the beginning.

It must be said that Congar does not always make it clear exactly how he understands the Spirit as being involved in the conception of Jesus, whether he adheres to the Scholastic interpretation that the Holy Spirit follows the Word and created sanctifying grace, gift of the Spirit, follows the grace of the (hypostatic) union in making the humanity of Jesus holy, or whether the grace of union could be interpreted as the work of the Spirit sent by the Father to bring about and sanctify the humanity which is then united to the person of the

Word. When he does try to be specific he runs into difficulty. It is clear, however, that the Spirit is understood as so involved for " as soon as the Christological aspect of the divine economy begins the Spirit is at work." [Congar, 1986,87.] This recognition of the unity of the work of the Word and the Spirit is in Christology as in ecclesiology, more important than which Person has priority. Congar is convinced that the Spirit has a constitutive role in the creation of Jesus as Son for us; his preference in discussing this is to follow the order of the intra-Trinitarian processions.

Congar's position is that he clings to the traditional Logos christology which holds that a human nature was assumed and united hypostatically with the divine Word, i.e. the human nature of Christ exists as person through that Word who is the eternal Son, begotten not made, the Monogenitus, yet he wants also to go from world to God i.e. from the history of salvation to a fuller understanding of Jesus Christ. This latter desire leads him to what seems to be an interpretation of the life of Jesus as a progressive becoming 'Son-for-us', a process in which he understands the Spirit to be involved.

In this he accords an important place to Jesus' baptism as a constitutive event in Christ's messianic enterprise. He understand that here is a new 'mission' of the Spirit, a making-present of Jesus' divine sonship and a constitution of him as the Christ , which affects Jesus' own consciousness of who he is and his condition as Servant of God. It must be remembered that Congar denies that the ontology of Jesus is in any way altered but asserts also that something new is nevertheless happening in history and in the history of God's communication with His people. Indeed he goes so far as to say that

> It was because the Spirit was acting in him that Jesus was able to manifest the sovereign mercy and loving kindness of God which is His kingdom. [Congar 1986, 88.]

He qualifies it however, by saying also that Jesus was already ontologically Son of God by the hypostatic union from the moment of his conception.

In the whole life of Jesus, not just in the Incarnation, God is working in and through a human (though also divine) person in the way God always works with His creation, through His Spirit. Congar believes that he, by understanding Jesus as acting, in the Spirit, as obedient servant of God, gives a salvific role to the humanity of Jesus because it is his human nature which is involved as his will chooses freely to do the will of His Father. Chalcedon

indicates that the hypostasis of the Son is the personal identity of Christ. Can one, then, think of a nature having an independent existence apart from its being enhypostasized in the person of the Son? The position might be different in a Christology 'from below' as opposed to the 'from above' approach. There would certainly be a real involvement of the human nature if Congar did understand there to be an actualisation of sonship during the life of Jesus, but the insistence on the fact that Jesus is ontologically Son by the hypostatic union, and the fact that Congar is not interested in modern philosophy suggests that this is probably not the case.

Although Congar is drawn to a Spirit approach to Christology he does not in the end formulate a totally satisfactory Spirit Christology. It must be said that he does not claim to do so, but the fact that his approach is not a fundamental one, is rather an attempt to make good some of the deficiencies of an incarnational Christology, means that the Spirit approach is not sufficiently developed. Congar is clear that the new Testament presents us with both a 'high' Christology of the Word made flesh and a study of Jesus of Nazareth, the one on whom the Spirit rests, the one who is proclaimed to be the Christ. His view is that there must then be an integrated approach to Christology which ensures that it takes account of both strands. The way he looks on Spirit Christology not as replacing Logos Christology but as making good its deficiencies by way of addition, makes one feel that he still really perceives the uniqueness of Jesus to depend on his being the Word made flesh . The incarnational approach is still for him the dominant one, he is still close in spirit to Aquinas. Because of this he does not consider in detail how the uniqueness of Jesus could be retained within a Spirit Christology and this must be seen as a weakness. Kasper and Rosato, in their spiritual christologies, both ground the uniqueness of Jesus in the Resurrection. Kasper understands Jesus as not only unique as bearer of the Spirit, who as " the transcendental-theological possibility of a free self-communication of God to man in history " enables Jesus to be God's openness to creation, but divinely confirmed as such, and as giver of the Spirit to all, by his Resurrection through the power of God's Spirit. Rosato sees the paschal event as the focal point on which the love-intention of God, Father, Son and Spirit, is concentrated before it opens out to embrace all of humanity.

Thus

> The activity of the Spirit of the Father and the Son could be understood as a spiralling cone of energy which fills in the fullness of time the person of Jesus, and at the point of the Resurrection wholly includes his history into his own, opens up his history as a possibility for all men, and through the unique fate of one man embraces all of natural and human history in a spiralling movement towards future union in the kingdom. [Rosato 1977,445.]

While Congar says that by raising him from the dead God proclaimed Jesus His Son even in his humanity, he does not develop this area further.

Again, although Congar endeavours to give, the humanity of Christ a real role in redemption, he does not entirely succeed because he does not provide a full Christology 'from below', one which begins with the human Jesus, makes his humanity meaningful and goes on from there to discuss his relationship with God, his oneness with the Father.

All the building blocks for further development are there in Father Congar's theology - the importance of God's plan of salvation history centred on Christ and looking towards eschatological fulfilment, the centrality of the Resurrection to Christ's mission to us and the connection of the Spirit with that mission - but one does not have the total satisfaction of a completely integrated presentation, partly because the culmination of his work on the Spirit took place in his later years, and partly perhaps because his interests centre on ecclesiology and the practical and pastoral results of theology and christology. It can be conceded however, that he has done what was all he intended to do, to give the Spirit a place in Christology, to move " Towards a Pneumatological Christology" [Congar 1983, III,165-173]

It is submitted that it has been shown that Congar has, with the reservations mentioned above, incorporated the Spirit in his Christology, and in so doing has accomplished part of what is necessary if his theology is to be described as pneumatological in the sense of being unified through an understanding of the role and work of the Spirit. What still remains is to see whether pneumatology is also integrated with his anthropology and ecclesiology.

Congar's work can, in one way of understanding it, be seen as an aspect of the various efforts he has made throughout his career to present the Christian faith as a credible alternative to unbelief. Since at least 1935, when he undertook an

enquiry into the contemporary causes of unbelief, he has been convinced of the necessity of presenting God as ' God- for - us', a living God who has a plan for the world. [Lauret, 1988, 61.] This is a God who " places beings outside Himself in order to bring them back to Himself so that they can participate in what He is in His sovereign existence." [Congar, 1983, II, 67.] In other words he wants to present a God who is relevant to the lives of human beings. Part of this is presenting faith, revelation, and the process of salvation in a credible way which does not do violence to human reason and this includes a plausible explanation of how God communicates with us. Part of the answer which Congar gives to this question is that it is through His Spirit. For the human being intelligibility has to do with making connections; there has to be some reason connected with what is known of the Spirit to suggest that he might plausibly be linked to communication.

Chapter Three indicated how Congar sets out the Scriptural witness to the theological understanding of the Spirit as God in touch with His creation, present in and to it as the "principle of life, newness and holy conduct", the principle of the going-forth of God, in freedom, to His people. He is the finger of God, [L.11, 20.] the sign of His power, writing the law of God in our hearts. [2 Cor.3,2-3.] The Spirit is Spirit of God expressing Him as source of the effects produced in men and women and in the world. Congar is concerned with the former rather than with the latter. He remarks that he was criticised by Jurgen Moltmann because I Believe in the Holy Spirit contained no development of the cosmic role of the Spirit.[Congar 1986,122] Chapter Three sets out also how he develops the concept of the Spirit as Gift, not statically but with eschatological fulfilment in mind. The Spirit is for Congar the instrument, or rather the Person, through whom the divine is in touch with creation, the Person through whom, in a particular way, God draws that creation, especially creation in human form, back to Himself. His primary theological premise is that God is love, that He is God-for-us having ordered His people to salvation from the moment of their creation, and the fruit of his mature theology is the development of how this comes about not only through the Word of God but also and equally through His Spirit.

What Congar does do therefore, relevant to a full pneumatology, and within that to the presentation of a coherent system of belief, is, as has been indicated in the relevant chapters above, to link up the theology of the Third Person as he is within the unity of the Godhead, with what he does in Christ, in the individual and in the Church. There is a perception of the connection between

the eternal processions and the temporal ' missions' of the Spirit, grounded in the belief that the Spirit is, within the divine generosity of the God whose nature is love, and love which has a tendency to go outwith itself, the principle of that movement.[Congar, 1966, 343,n.1.]

Although Congar understands the necessity of developing a theological anthropology which would deal with the modern problem of bringing to belief, he does not in fact carry this out. For this, as has been said, he has been criticised. We have seen that Congar understands the human being as God's supreme creation, made in His image. This suggests a pre-disposition to accept the gospel message, to see revelation as the primary factor in theology providing a satisfactory answer to questions about the meaning of human existence and to understand the role of philosophical enquiry to be to show that message does not do violence to human reason, is compatible with it. Congar does not do enough in addressing these questions in spite of acknowledging that the root of modern difficulty in accepting traditional religion is philosophic. On the other hand, while acknowledging the efforts of theologians to bring together theology and philosophy, to use the most up-to-date insights of the latter to illuminate the former, it is questionable whether it is in fact possible to reason men and women into belief in God. Theology cannot joust with the 'hard' sciences on their ground, and 'win' in the sense of providing the empirical proofs that would be acceptable. It is a discipline of a different sort; this does not mean that it has nothing to say to modern man. Congar is perhaps too concerned with intra and inter Church problems, but this is not an irrelevant area. A pity as it may seem, how Christianity presents herself does affect the unbelieving world. Holy people, a Church living up to her principles, and Churches at peace convey a powerful message. Congar was concerned with ways in which the Roman Catholic Church could and should reform herself, and saw many of his ideas incorporated in the documents of the Second Vatican Council, but according to Aidan Nichols he was disappointed that the peace and harmony which he expected to follow did not materialise as in the Church and between the Churches problems continued and the very concept of organised religion seemed to become more and more irrelevant to the lives of individuals.

He says that

> Although Congar's expressions of dismay were circumspect and mainly private, the undertone is that of the lament in Jeremiah 14,19.
>
> 'We expected peace, but good was it not;
> a time of healing, but there came disturbance.' [Nichols 1989,180-181]

Nichols goes on to say that his response was not to compromise but to try to re-present his anthropological view. One of the pillars on which Congar's anthropology rests is Scripture. The Bible provides a theology for men and 'an anthropology for God'. [Granfield 1967,149] This indicates not only that God and man cannot be separated but also that Scriptural revelation actually tells us what it means to be human, and so is the key to understanding all human relationships. This has necessitated a new evaluation of man in the world, his being and activity, especially in relation to his fellows.[cf Congar 1967c,27] Consequently the notion of the 'image of God' is important to Congar. A theological anthropology rests on this premise, that man is different from the rest of nature, though in solidarity with it. Congar has a very positive view of man made in the image of God as rational and endowed with free will. This is Thomistic; the Summa Theologica quotes John Damascene - the image of God in man belongs to him " as an intelligent being endowed with free choice and self-movement" (S.T.I,q 93,a5)

There are objections to the traditional approach which locates the image in reason. It leads to individualism, for example.[Gunton 1991,48] It can also be used by those who want to deny basic rights to those perceived to be non-rational, the old, the mentally ill, the unborn. Congar does not discuss this but it is submitted, goes beyond the purely rational to include the relational. This not only has practical consequences but also ensures that the Trinity has anthropological relevance.[supra Chapter Five 1.a.1]

Congar also adverts to the fact that God imparts to human beings 'a movement' and 'a desire' " that is an echo of his own desire that he has revealed to us as his Spirit" [Congar 1983,II,67] This, it is submitted, means that the Spirit who is in God, the God who is revealed as communicating with and communicating Himself to humanity, ecstatic love, is the source in human beings of the longing for love which draws them back to their Creator. John Zizioulas expressing something of the same thought but in more philosophical

terms, speaks of the desire to 'be God', to achieve personhood in His image.[Zizioulas 1991,43] The image of God in us is the source of the fundamental kinship between the Divine and the human. That this kinship is relational implies that this is the way we come to know God. The human person is a being with an in-built capacity to be called by God, to be the recipient of the revelation of God's own design. "This is...the sign of our transcendence and of endowment with free will." [Congar 1985a, 44.]

The possibility of our being given the Spirit is connected with this fundamental kinship as well as with Christology. For Congar there is no radical division between nature and grace.[supra Chapter Five1.a.1] Grace pre-supposes nature. It is a state, a supernatural state, of nature. Oneness with the Creator is basic to human nature in its perfection. [cf. de Lubac, 'Catholicism' 178. " the vision of God is a free gift yet the desire for it is at the root of every soul."]

Such a view seems opposed to that of Barth, for example; he, while acknowledging the greatness of man does so only as caused by the person and work of the Holy Spirit. Philip Rosato says that Barth can accept the anthropocentric phraseology of Schleiermacher "provided that man is what he is only because the Spirit causes him to become such through eschatological grace."[Rosato 1981,37.] It is not that Congar is asserting the independence of the human being; rather he sees him or her in a situation of balanced freedom and dependence, inserted into a created cosmos, able to know some things unaided, others only by the call of the Creator, to which he is by nature pre-disposed to listen. The human mind is open to intelligibility, can make judgements, arrive at truth. This is an important fact in relation to dealing with modern problems, for it allows questioners to see that the inviolable rights of their intelligence are respected. Congar understands that people, especially the young, will not accept impositions which are not justified in terms of their consciousness. [Congar 1977, 77-78.] He does not feel however, that all that is wanted is rational explanations of existential problems. He perceives also that people are searching for " an interiority open to transcendence" and it is to this yearning that the Church must proclaim God's answer in the revelation of His plan of salvation, offered to men and women for their acceptance. [Congar 1978, 165]

Congar as has been said is concerned with the human being as free personal subject, made in the image of a God who is Person. In him or her human nature is hypostasized. Personalism is, he says, before becoming

individualistic and subjective, a Christian value. [Congar 1977,61] He is convinced that the human person must be free, how otherwise could there be any meaning in the concept of a 'judgement' by God. [ICongar 1983,II,108.] There is a sense then, in which we 'merit' eternal life. This though it is one of his most central and important tenets, may present some difficulty ecumenically unless properly presented and understood. It is not that Congar denies to God the initiative, but simply that he sees that we have to give our consent and co-operation. This reflects a profound truth that man can only be said to be in the image of God if he has this freedom to reject Him. To say that a being who is merely acting out a role already determined for him, is in the image of God, is surely self-contradictory and demeaning to the nature of God Himself. Congar makes it clear, however, that he understands that our co-operation would be impossible without the Holy Spirit's provision of the 'dynamism'. It is submitted that he understands it as a partnership in which our co-operation is a reflection and the result of the freedom, the out-going love, which is God. Thus

> "Our actions, which may 'merit' eternal life, are elements in a chain of grace in which the Holy Spirit as uncreated grace takes the initiative and provides the dynamism until the ultimate victory is reached in which God is merely crowning his own gifts when he awards us a crown for our 'merits'." [Congar 1983, II,108.]

It is necessary to ensure that , while the transcendence and gratuity of God is respected, the freedom of man is also protected especially when biological science seems bent on trying to remove this concept from the agenda.

Congar's believes that what he has said of who and what man is, and who and for whom Christ is, must be interpreted pneumatologically. The Holy Spirit dwells in the human being situated in the real historical world ; the Holy Spirit makes sons and daughters of God out of people who, though sinful are called to a perfect destiny.[Congar 1986,122] In other words he believes that all the spheres, Trinitarian, Christological, anthropological and pneumatological inter-penetrate one another.

His pneumatological anthropology rests on the belief that God has created beings outside Himself in order to bring them back to Himself.[Congar 1983,II,67.] It is then, Trinitarian, going back to the intra-divine life itself, and indeed to the very nature of God. It is the basis for a belief in a universal

election which Congar envisages as encompassing not only the creation of human beings, but also their salvation and eschatological fulfilment. As the Spirit is understood in relation to creation " by virtue of his consubstantiality and the perichoresis of the Divine Persons" [Congar 1986,123.] so he is seen as more personally involved in the Incarnation and our salvation .

It is submitted that Congar has successfully demonstrated that the Spirit is central to the framing of a theological anthropology. The Spirit is the means by which it becomes truly Trinitarian. It is an achievement of Congar that he has gone beyond simple appropriation towards a personal role for the Spirit while maintaining the unity of Trinitarian action. The Spirit is understood as being, because of who he is, the means by which the divine is in contact with humanity. [Congar 1983, I,33.] The action of God moves outwards from its source in the Father, through the Son whose salvific being and work are ' in the Spirit', so that the Spirit who is Spirit of the Son may cause all to return, in the Spirit, through the Son to the Father. [cf. Moltmann, 1977,62-64.]

The possibility of this action of the Spirit, his making of us adopted sons of God, is also integrated with Christology. It is grounded in his being both Spirit of the Son and the bringer of the Son to humanity in the Incarnation. He is " the one who introduced the Son into this world in the womb of the Virgin Mary." [Congar 1986,123.] He is the one who makes Jesus Messiah/Son at his baptism and resurrection. That is, the Holy Spirit whom Congar perceives to be connected particularly with the eschatological future, is involved with the transformation of the historical Jesus of Nazareth into the " eschatological Adam", life-giving Spirit. In other words it is because the Spirit is constitutively with and in the incarnate Son who is Saviour, that he can be given by the Son. The Spirit made Jesus Son for us. The Spirit makes us sons of, and for, God. In addition it is justified by the fact that the Spirit does the same work in Jesus and in us; as the earthly Jesus was the temple of the Spirit so are we now; as the Spirit by the Resurrection made the humanity of Jesus a humanity of the Son of God, so he enables us to be born anew and from above into sonship, a sonship which we will have fully eschatologically having now only the earnest of it. Congar understands history as open, as progressing to eschatological fulfilment and he associates the Spirit not only with the making of Jesus "eschatological Adam", gateway to God's future, but also with the movement of salvation forwards, present in every new moment in which the gospel is preached and the message appropriated. There is no hint here of any diminution of the importance of the Spirit in relation to Christ, indeed the

reverse; in the Spirit God's communication of Himself is completed. .

In acknowledging that the Spirit finds in Jesus Christ total openness and acceptance of God's gift and promise, Congar lays the foundation for a pneumatological anthropology based on a pneumatological Christology. The same Spirit who is in Jesus is in all humanity enabling each one to be son in the mould of Jesus perfect sonship, and this because the glorified Lord is able to impart his Spirit. [cf. Kasper1977,267-268 which Congar quotes in such a way as to suggest that he accepts Kasper's explanation as mirroring his own.{Congar 1986,123.}]

We have in this pneumatological anthropology an understanding of the Spirit as opening to creatures the possibility of being sons with the Son when all is gathered together and presented to the Father. Congar is careful to ensure that it is understood that there is no question of our being sons in the same way as Christ, no question of a pantheistic absorbing, no 'mystical 'merging of God and man. He refers to Schweizer's stress on the fact that Paul, when saying that the Spirit prays in us, is thinking in biblical terms of the Spirit's force or dynamism; the dynamism of a God who is present in the Christian by His Spirit but is not merged with the being of that Christian.[Congar 1983, I,32.]

Congar therefore, brings together anthropology and Christology by way of pneumatology, explaining that the plan of God is accomplished when the many are incorporated by the Spirit, into the One who has a perfect filial relationship with the Father. John Zizioulas speaks of this relationship of salvation in terms of the 'collective personality' of Christ and says that it is impossible to conceive of it without the pneumatological element. [Zizioulas 1985, 138.]

This life of sonship is an ecclesial life. The heart of Congar's theology is his ecclesiology so it is not surprising that this is recognised in his definition of pneumatology.

> By pneumatology I mean something other than a simple dogmatic theology of the Third person. I also mean more than, and in this sense different from, a profound analysis of the indwelling Spirit in individual souls and his sanctifying activity there. Pneumatology should... describe the impact, in a context of a vision of the Church, of the fact that the Spirit distributes his gifts as he wills and in this way builds up the church. A study of this kind involves not simply a consideration of those gifts and charisms, but a theology of the

Church.[Congar 1983, I,156.]

Pneumatology does not mean, however, complete autonomy of the Spirit. If it is to be sound it must incorporate a Christological reference. In ecclesiology, therefore, the Spirit must be recognised as doing only the work of Christ, building up the body of Christ. The importance of the relationship to Christ, with the Word, the Sacraments and the institution of the Church, must be respected at the same time as the place and function of the Spirit is given due weight.[Congar 1983,I,141.]

It has been argued that Congar's understanding of the Church gradually became more pneumatological, less christocentric. As in his Christology it is dissatisfaction with the existing presentation which led to the change in emphasis. In the case of his ecclesiology the influence of Moehler plays a part as Congar himself acknowledges. [supra Chapter1.d.] Congar would have liked to begin the Unam Sanctam series with Moehler's Unity in the Church and this because he perceived it to be a counter to the then prevailing ecclesiology with its emphasis on the institutional, teaching Church, imposing obedience on its members, a systematic ecclesiology which Congar felt impoverished Catholicism.[Congar 1970,]]

Moehler's interest in this work was, Congar says, to underline the fact that the Church has, as her founding principle a spiritual gift from which all else comes; the same principle, gift of the Holy Spirit, gives Christians the impetus which allows them to confess the truth and to live in a communion of fraternal love in the bosom of the Church. [Congar 1963a,519.]

Congar, and probably Moehler himself, was also influenced by his ecumenical contact with Protestantism with its lively sense of the relevance of the interior living experience in Christianity.

Moehler then, and Congar in his wake, drew attention to the importance of the principle of life in the Church and this by way of a recovery of the insights of the first three centuries of her history; this re-discovery of the Holy Spirit as the principle of the vertical dimension of life in the Church, i.e. that it is through the Spirit that the plan of God to move from His own unity to that of the eschatological Body of Christ is accomplished, goes hand in hand with the Holy Spirit as also the principle of communion and unity among the members of the Church, and is consonant with the pneumatological anthropology outlined above.

The increasing of the pneumatological in his ecclesiology goes hand in hand,

it is suggested, with Congar's more pneumatological understanding of Christology. As well as the Spirit being conceived of as imparted by the risen Christ, he comes to be understood also as being involved in the constitution of the Christ, at his baptism and even at his conception. Parallel to this there develops an understanding of the involvement of the Spirit also in the very constitution of the Church which is the body of Christ. When this does not happen, when the Christological emphasis is dominant as it was in the Roman Catholic Church especially in the centuries after the Reformation, the Church comes to be seen as a society, established by Jesus Christ and continuing to exist under the authority of its pastors led by the Pope, successor to St. Peter. To put it somewhat baldly, to characterise her as an institution, a society, is to concentrate on the structuring elements which come from the pre-paschal Jesus. This results, in ecclesiastical practice, in a concentration on the hierarchical, at the expense of the living reality in which the laity also have a part to play. In theology it means that the Holy Spirit is understood as the 'soul' of the Church in a monophysitic way rather than as carrying out his own mission of building up the body of which Christ is the head. To characterise the Church as a communion, on the other hand, is to incorporate the function, based on being, of the Spirit as communicator, not only of the divine to the human but also of love and service between the members of the Church. A more pneumatological Christology leads to the recognition that the Spirit is involved in the being of Christ, who has that Spirit in the fullest possible way, and from this presence in Christ the head, the Spirit comes to those who make up his mystical body. What is important here is not so much the question of whether christology or pneumatology should have priority, but rather the ensuring that they are understood as an unbreakable unity, that the pneumatological is totally integrated with the christological as Word and Spirit together carry out the work of the Father. This Congar succeeds in doing.

The Church is in his mature theology, understood by Congar as the product of the two divine 'missions', of the Son and of the Spirit; both contribute to her being and the different images used to describe this being are indicative, among other things, of the respective contributions of the Son and of the Spirit.

Throughout the consideration of Congar's ecclesiology we have been aware of his interest in the relationship between the concept of the Church as fellowship with God in Christ and her being also means of grace, institution of

salvation. In time, in history, Christians only share partially, 'amid sighings' in the " communion of human persons with divine Persons" and have need for the means of grace which bring about the ultimate reality of the community of the saved. Congar's understanding has been shown to be of the Church as one reality which is both gift and task, given by God, through Christ, in her structural reality, built up by the faithful in the Spirit, and the emphasis moves gradually more towards the latter element as the pneumatological side of his theology develops.

Congar's ecclesiological work in the early stages emphasised the institutional or Christological aspect of the Church but an interest in the Spirit was never absent. He is seen working towards a way of involving the Spirit, for example in The Holy Spirit and the Apostolic College [Congar 1965,105-145] but from a dualistic position. [supra Chapter 6,2.b] In his later work, however, he re-dresses the balance and the Holy Spirit is given not only a constitutive role in the founding of the Church, but is discussed as the one who makes the Church a communion which is one, holy, catholic and apostolic. This consideration of the Church as a communion is intended as a correction of the image of her as a pyramidal structure in which the hierarchy is dominant. It has its ultimate origin in a vision of God as a communion of Persons, a vision, according to John Zizioulas, going back to Basil of Caesarea and in his theology indicating that 'communion' is an ontological category; the nature of God is communion. [Zizioulas 1985,134] Congar speaks in terms of the nature of God existing only in the Persons who are perfectly present to one another and communicate to one another everything except their distinguishing characteristics and that which consists in a subsisting relationship. This is perhaps less than according to personhood and communion in God an ontological character, but Congar is interested only in understanding the Church as reflecting the mystery of the tri-unity of God as a community of persons participating in the same realities of life.

In the time of the Church, between Alpha and Omega, hierarchy and laity are understood to work together to bring all to total fulfilment in Christ. It is a time of task and therefore a time of reform as the historical Church struggles to conform to the Gospel message. In bringing the Spirit into ecclesiology Congar emphasises the importance of each individual member of the Church Congar's more pneumatological approach, part of the basis for his communion ecclesiology, allows him to understand the Church as a community structured not only according to the ordained ministry but also by all the ministries or

services which derive from the charisms given by the Holy Spirit to the members so that the Body of Christ might be built up.[supra Chapter Seven, 4]

This is not to say that he has abandoned the structural aspect . Just as in his Christology he still hankers after the incarnational explanation, so even in his communion ecclesiology he clings to the institutional aspect. He certainly attempts to reconcile the two by saying that a sound pneumatology always points to the work of Christ, that it is the Body of Christ which is being built up by the charismatic gifts of the members of the Church. T. I. MacDonald feels that in continuing to think of the 'person-Church', Congar indicates a subordination of the life aspect to the institutional and so does not accord sufficient weight to the historical reality. [MacDonald,1984, 266]

The Church, however, is more than those who make it up and there is a certain necessary tension between the two aspects. [supra,Chapter Six, 2b2] It is argued that Congar does not continue to give undue weight to the institutional aspect. He firmly places the institution within the communion; essentially the Church is a communion with ministers rather than a legal institution whose core is power. [Lauret 1988,.42-43.] Certainly he is reluctant to state decisively that the Church should ideally be structured by the charisms, preferring to cling to the dual pattern of charism and ministry, but writing in 1984 of religious life in France he describes the new initiatives there in the life of the Church as

> an expression of the charisms or talents which the Spirit is giving to so many people for the building up of the Body of Christ and which can be seen as the 'principle of order' of a Church that is being re-born from its foundations.[Congar 1986,82.]

He certainly departs from the primacy of the hierarchy in his understanding of 'reception' [supra Chapter Six, 5c] The preservation of the Tradition of the faith which comes to us from the Apostles is the work of the whole people of God indwelt by the Spirit; however within this the magisterium " interprets, teaches and authoritatively formulates that Tradition." [Congar 1986, 81.] This would be interpreted by some as still giving too much power via the magisterium to the institution.

In addition to his treatment of reception, the way he handles collegiality and conciliarity indicate a great step away from the primacy of the institutional.

In the face of challenge to the traditional magisterial authority of the Church Congar reacts neither with the pessimism which hankers after the past nor with uncritical condemnation of that past. Rather he lives with the hope that the Spirit, eschatological gift, will provide a way forward, a way in which the gifts of the faithful will be harnessed and magisterial authority will be interpreted as simply another form of ministry within the community. Somewhat along these lines Karl Rahner sees office in a declericalized Church, one which grows from below, as effective no longer in virtue of power over, but because of the obedience of faith which members offer Christ.[Rahner 1972,57]

Of course Congar has, correctly, no intention of going down the hazardous road of total autonomy of the spiritual in ecclesiology, but his insights have enriched the Church and helped her development. If one is, however, to maintain the primacy of the People of God over the structuring elements which was suggested by the Second Vatican Council's document on the Church, it may be necessary to ensure that the charisms of the faithful are protected institutionally and canonically. To take the pneumatological element seriously is surely to arrange that all believers share in Church decisions, yet this is not what has happened in practice whatever may have been the ideal of participation envisaged. Still firmly in place is a hierarchical ecclesial structure which effectively limits the function of governing to the clergy. The real way forward would be through a different clergy/laity relationship enshrined in Canon law. Only if this was in place would the gifts of the Spirit to the people be able to be fully incorporated.

Congar is unwilling to make any outright criticisms in spite of approving of the Church reforming herself "through the grass roots"[Lauret1988,48] His approach is always to try to balance the christological with the pneumatological, and since he is of the generation which embraced the optimistic approach enshrined in the documents of the Second Vatican Council, and in addition believes firmly in the power of the Spirit to transform, he believes that this balance can be achieved. He puts perhaps too little emphasis on the fact that between Alpha and Omega the power of sin, the weakness of humanity, with all its freedom for bad as well as for good, still exists. It is partly because of this human condition that human laws are needed in society and perhaps the Council should have ensured that its more optimistic intentions were given the status of Canon law.

In spite of the developments since Vatican II one senses with the hierarchy, a

disinclination to go too far from the institutional which suggests a deep-rooted fear of the uses to which a pneumatological approach may be put. Yet surely it is only by keeping the pneumatological within the institutional that one can avoid displacing Christ from the centre of ecclesiology at a time when there is an appeal to the Spirit as support for the desire of the faithful to have a louder voice in the Church. The hierarchy must accept that the Spirit blows where he wills and though theirs by virtue of their ministry, is not confined to their ranks. Congar is as conscious of this need to make it known that the charisms are within the Church, and welcome there, as was Irenaeus so many centuries ago, which is why he speaks of the whole Church renewing herself charismatically. His is the insight that the sacramental structure of the Church, as memory of foundational event, sign of the eschatological future and present grace, is unified by the Spirit. " So far from the comings of the Holy Spirit to the Church challenging and questioning its institutional character, they establish it in truth."[Congar 1983, III,271] Her very nature is that she is co-instituted by the Spirit, made what she is by him and ever in need of his guidance and grace. Her life must be, therefore, one long epiclesis.[Congar 1983,III.271]

A historian by inclination, rather than a systematic theologian, a prodigious worker, immersed in the thought of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, and well read in the theology of not only his own denomination, Yves Congar emerges from a study of his theology as a Catholic churchman, at peace with the traditions of his Church, but able to look at them objectively, concerned with how best to understand her in order to present her most effectively to a world waiting to hear her good news. He personifies that openness to truth and to experience which Richard McBrien sees as characteristic of Catholicism.

> characterised by a radical openness to all truth and to every value. It is comprehensive and all-embracing towards the totality of Christian experience and tradition and all the theological, doctrinal, spiritual, liturgical, canonical, institutional and social richness and diversity of that experience and tradition.
> [McBrien 1980, 1173.]

Father Congar is, of course a theologian of his time; his approach seems very traditional. He indulges in no critical outbursts, produces no new paradigm for theology. To those who do not remember the Roman Catholic Church before

the Second Vatican Council what he says may not seem radical. To those who do remember it was revolutionary.

As for pneumatology, a consideration of Congar's Christology, anthropology and ecclesiology allow it to be said that here is a theologian who has attempted and to a large extent succeeded, in using the doctrine of the Spirit in a constructive fashion to elucidate and unite these major areas of theology. A theologian who has grounded his approach in the Trinitarian Person of the Spirit , has given that Spirit a role in the person and work of Christ, in the individual believer and his salvation, and has made the Spirit co-founder of the Church, principle of its life and agent of its growth as body of Christ through the charisms of its members, may fairly be described as 'pneumatological'.

Alberigo, G., Jossua J.P., & Kommonchak J.A. (eds.) (1987) *The Reception of Vatican II,* Washington, Catholic University of America Press (translation of *La Réception de Vatican II,* Paris, 1985)

Alberigo, G. (1984) *The People of God in the Experience of Faith,* Concilium, 171-176, pp. 24-34

Aquinas, Thomas, *Summa Theologica,*

Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, *De Trinitate,* (translation by M. Dods, Edinburgh)

von Balthasar, Hans Urs, (1980) *A Short Primer for Unsettled Laymen* San Francisco, Ignatius Press

von Balthasar, Hans Urs, (1967) *Spiritus Creator,* Skizzen zur Theologie III, Einsiedeln

Basil of Caesarea, *The Holy Spirit,* (translation by G. Lewis. Religious Tract Society, London)

Boff, Leonardo, (1978) *Église en Genèse, Les Communautés de Base Reinventent L'Église,* Paris, Cerf

Botte B., Marot H, et al. eds.(1960) *Le Concile et Les Conciles,* Paris,Cerf

Bouyer, Louis (1948), *Christianisme et Eschatologie, La Vie Intellectuelle,* pp. 6-38

Chaillet, P. (ed) (1939) *L'Église est Une, Hommage à Moehler,* Paris, Bloud and Gay

Chenu, M.D. (1985) *Une École de Théologie, Le Saulchoir*, Paris, Cerf. Original edition, Paris 1937

Chenu, M.D. (1968) *Faith and Theology,* Dublin & Sydney, Gill & Son (translation of *La Parole de Dieu,* Paris)

Coffey, David (1984) *The Incarnation of the Holy Spirit in Christ,* Theological Studies 45, 1984, pp. 466-480

Coffey, David (1990) *The Holy Spirit as the Mutual Love of the Father and the Son,* Theological Studies, 51, pp. 193-229

Congar, Yves, (1932) *Histoire de la philosophie du Moyen Age,* Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques, 21, pp.596-616

Congar, Yves, (1935) *Une Conclusion Théologique a L'Enquete sur les raisons actuelles de l'incroyance.* La Vie Intellectuelle, 2, pp.214-248

Congar, Yves, (1937) *Comptes Rendus*, Bulletin Thomiste 5, pp.487-505

Congar, Yves, (1938) *Sur l'évolution et l'interpretation de la pensée de Moehler*, Revue du Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques,27, pp.205-212.
Congar, Yves, (1939) *Divided Christendom*, London, Butler and Tanner, (translation of *Chrétiens désunis*, Paris, Cerf,1937)
Congar, Yves, (1950) *Mentalité 'de droit' et integrisme*. La Vie Intellectuelle 18, pp.644-666.
Congar, Yves, (1957) *Christ, Our Lady and the Church*, Westminster, Maryland, Newman Press (translation of *Le Christ, Marie et L'Eglise*, Paris, Desclee, 1952)
Congar, Yves (1959) *Si vous êtes mes témoins, Trois Conferences sur Laicat, Église et Monde*, Paris, Cerf
Congar, Yves,(1959a) *After Nine Hundred Years: The Background of the Schism between Eastern and Western Churches*, New York, Fordham University Press
Congar, Yves, (1960) *Conclusion* in *Le Concile et les Conciles, Botte, Marot et al.*, Paris
Congar, Yves, (1961) *The Wide World my Parish*, London, Darton, Longman & Todd (translation of *Vaste monde ma paroisse*, Paris, Temoinage Chretien, 1959)
Congar, Yves, (1962) *De la Communion des Églises à une Écclesiologie de L'Église Universelle* in *L'Épiscopat et L'Église Universelle* ed. Congar et Dupuy, Paris, Cerf
Congar, Yves, (1962a) *La Foi et la Théologie*, Tournai, Desclee
Congar, Yves, (1962b) *The Mystery of the Temple*, London, Burns and Oates (translation of *Le mystère du Temple*, Paris, Cerf, 1958)
Congar, Yves, (1963) *Tradition et 'Sacra Doctrina' chez St. Thomas d'Aquin* in *Église et Tradition*, ed. J. Betz et H. Fries, Lyon , Xavier Mappus,
Congar, Yves, (1963a) *Sainte Église, Paris*, Cerf, Unam Sanctam 41
Congar, Yves, (1964) *Chretiéns en dialogue*, Paris, Cerf
Congar, Yves, (1964a) *Power and Poverty in the Church*, London, Chapman (translation of *Pour Une Église servante et pauvre*, Paris, 1963)
Congar, Yves, (1964b) *Tradition and the Life of the Church*, London, Burns and Oates (translation of *La Tradition et la vie de L'Église*, Paris, 1963)
Congar, Yves, (1965) *The Mystery of the Church*, London, Chapman (1960) (translation of *Esquisses du mystère de L'Église* and *La Pentecôte*, Paris, Cerf, 1941 & 56)

Congar, Yves, (1966) *Tradition and Traditions,* London, Burns and Oates (translation of *La Tradition et les traditions,* Librairie Artheme Fayard, 1960 & 63)

Congar, Yves, (1966a) *Christ in the Economy of Salvation and in Our Dogmatic Tracts,* Concilium 2, 1, pp.4-15

Congar, Yves, (1966b) *Jesus Christ,* New York, Herder & Herder (translation of *Jésus Christ,* Paris, Cerf, 1965)

Congar, Yves, (1966c) *Theology's Task after Vatican II,* Theology and Renewal, 1, pp. 47-65

Congar, Yves, (1966d) *Theology in the Council,* American Ecclesiastical Review 155, pp.217-230

Congar, Yves, (1967a) *Priest and Layman,* London Darton, Longman and Todd (translation of *Sacerdoce et Laïcat,* Paris, Cerf, 1962)

Congar, Yves, (1967b) *Ecumenism and the Future of the Church,* Chicago, Priory Press

Congar, Yves, (1967c) *Situations et tâches presentes de la théologie,* Paris, Cerf

Congar, Yves, (1967d) *Le Moment 'Économique' et le moment 'Ontologique' dans la Sacra Doctrina,* Melanges Offert a M.D., Chénu, Paris, Libriarie Philosophique J. Vrin, pp.135-187

Congar, Yves, (1968) *Vraie et fausse reforme dans L'Eglise,* Paris, Cerf, (Original Edition 1950)

Congar, Yves, (1968a) *A History of Theology,* New York, Doubleday & Co.

Congar, Yves, (1968b) *The Revelation of God,* London, Darton Longaman & Todd (translation, with Faith and Spiritual Life, of *Les Voies du Dieu vivant,* Paris, Cerf, 1962)

Congar, Yves, (1969) *This Church that I Love,* New Jersey, Dimension Books (translation of *Cette Église que J'aime,* Paris, Cerf, 1969)

Congar, Yves, (1969a) *Faith and the Spiritual Life,* London, Darton Longman & Todd (translation, with The Revelation of God, of *Les Voies du Dieu vivant,* Paris, Cerf, 1962)

Congar, Yves, (1970) *Pneumatologie ou Christominisme dans la tradition latine?* in *Ecclesia a Spiritu Sanctu Edocta,* Melanges Theologique, Hommage a Mgr. Gerard Philips, Gembloux, pp. 41-63

Congar, Yves, (1970a) *L'Église une sainte catholique et apostolique,* Paris, Cerf, Mysterium Salutis 15,

Congar, Yves, (1970b) *Infaillibilité et Indefectibilité,* Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Théologiques, 54, pp.601-618

Congar, Yves, (1970c) *Johann Adam Möhler 1796-1838,* Theologische Quartalschrift ,1, pp.48-51

Congar, Yves, (1971) *Ministères et Communion Écclesiale,* Paris, Cerf

Congar, Yves, (1972) *The Church as an Assembly and the Church as Essentially Conciliar,* in *Theologians Today,* ed. Martin Redfern, New York, Sheed and Ward

Congar, Yves, (1972a) *Reception as an Ecclesiological Reality,* Concilium,7, pp. 43-68

Congar, Yves, (1973) *Renewed Actuality of the Holy Spirit,* Lumen Vitae, 28, pp. 13-30

Congar, Yves,(1973a) *Actualité d'une Pneumatologie,* Proche-Orient Chretien, 23, pp.121-132

Congar, Yves, (1973b) *R. Sohm nous interroge encore,* Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et theologiques, pp.263-287

Congar, Yves, (1974) *La Tri-unité de Dieu et de L'Église,* La Vie Spirituelle, 128, pp. 187-703. Also in *Essais Oecumeniques,* Paris, Centurion, 1984, pp.297- 312

Congar, Yves, (1974a) *Le Traité de la Force dans la Somme Theologique de Saint Thomas D'Aquin* Angelicum 51, pp.331-348

Congar, Yves, (1974b) *Renouveau dans L'Esprit*, La Croix, Jan.19

Congar, Yves, (1975) *Un Peuple Messianique,* Paris, Cerf

Congar, Yves, (1978) *L'Église catholique et France moderne*, Paris, Cerf

Congar, Yves, (1980) *Les Implications christologiques et pneumatologique de l'écclesiologie de Vatican II,* in *Essais Oecumeniques,* 1984, (Originally in Actes du Colloque Internationale de Bologne, 1980)

Congar, Yves, (1981) *Reflections on Being a Theologian,* New Blackfriars 62, pp. 405-409

Congar, Yves, (1981a) *Towards a Catholic Synthesis,* Concilium, 148, pp. 147-50

Congar, Yves, (1983) *I Believe in the Holy Spirit,* London, Chapman

Vol.I *The Experience of the Spirit*

Vol.II *Lord and Giver of Life*

Vol.III *The River of Life Flows in the East and in the West*

(translation of *Je crois en L'Esprit Saint,* Paris, Cerf, 1979)

Congar, Yves, (1983a) *The Conciliar Structure or Regime of the Church,* Concilium, 166-70, pp. 3-8

Congar, Yves, (1984) *Diversity and Communion,* London, SCM Press (translation of *Diversité et Communion,* Paris, Cerf, 1982)

Congar, Yves, (1984a) *Essais Oecumeniques,* Paris, Centurion

Congar, Yves, (1984b) *Le Concile de Vatican II,* Paris, Cerf

Congar, Yves, (1985) *Lay People in the Church,* Chapman, London, (1957 & 1965) (translation of *Jalons pour une théologie du laïcat,* Paris, 1953, revised edition 1964)

Congar, Yves, (1985a) *Called to Life,* Slough, St. Paul's Publications (translation of *Appelés à la Vie,* Paris, Cerf, 1985)

Congar, Yves, (1986) *The Word and the Spirit,* London, Chapman (translation of *La Parole et Le Souffle,* Paris, Desclee)

Connolly, James (1961) *Yves Congar, the Church and the Churches,* in *Voices of France,* New York, The McMillan Co.

Copleston, F.C. (1955) *Aquinas,* London, Penguin

Danielou, J. (1946) *Les Orientations Présentes de La Pensée Religieuse,* Etudes 249, pp. 1-21

De La Potterie, Ignace (1958) *L'Onction du Christ:- Etude de Theologie Biblique,* Nouvelle Revue Theologique 80, pp. 225-252

De La Potterie; Ignace (1977) *Le Christ, Plerôme de L'Église,* (Ep.1, 22-23), Biblica 58, pp. 500-524

De La Potterie; Ignace (1986) *Reading Holy Scripture in the Spirit,* Communio 13, pp. 308-325

Devlin, Lord (1965) *The Enforcement of Morals,* London, Oxford University Press

Dru, A. (1963) *The Church in Nineteenth Century Germany, 1800-1918,* London

Duffy, S.J. (1992) *The Graced Horizon,* Minnesota, Michael Glazier Books

Duffy, S.J. (1993) *The Dynamics of Grace,* Minnesota, Michael Glazier Books

Dulles, Avery,(1987) *The Catholicity of the Church.* Oxford, Oxford University Press

Dulles, Avery, (1992) *The Craft of Theology, From Symbol to System,* Dublin, Gill and MacMillan Ltd.

Dunn, J.D.G. (1970) *Baptism in the Holy Spirit,* London, SCM Press

Dupuy, B.D. (1970) *Écriture et Tradition,* Chevetogne

Duquoc, Christian (1977) *Dieu Different,essai sur la symbolique trinitaire* Paris, Cerf
Eschweiler, K. (1930) *J.A. Mohler's Kirchenbegriff,* Bramsberg
Godin, H. & Daniel, Y. (1943) *France Pays de Mission,* Paris, Cerf
Granfield, Patrick (1967) *Theologians at Work,* New York, McMillan Co.
Greely, A, (1970) *Glossolalia: It's Rooted in Emotional Disturbance,* The National Catholic Reporter, 2nd.Oct.
Gunton, Colin, E. (1991) *Trinity, Ontology and Anthropology: Towards a Renewal of the Doctrine Imago Dei* in *Persons Divine and Human* (eds., Christoph Schwobel & Colin E. Gunton), Edinburgh, T & T Clark
Hart, H.L.A.(1994) *The Concept of Law,* Oxford, Clarendon Press, original edition 1961, Oxford University Press
Haya-Prats, G. (1975) *L'Esprit Force de L'Eglise ,Sa Nature et Son Activite D'Apres les Actes des Apotres,*Paris, Lectio Divine 81
Hendry, G.S., (1965) *The Holy Spirit,* London, SCM Press
Henn, William (1987) *The Hierarchy of Truths According to Yves Congar,* Rome, Editrice Pontificia Universita Gregoriana.
Heschel, A.J., (1951) *Man is not Alone,* New York, Farrar, Strauss and Young
John of the Cross, *Dark Night of the Soul* in *The Collected Works of St. John of the Cross.* Kavanaugh, K and Rodriguez,O, London, Nelson
Johnston, William (1978) *The Inner Eye of Love,* London, Font Paperbacks,
Jossua, J.P., (1966) *Une Philosophie du fait chretien, est-elle possible?,* Revue des Sciences Philosophiques et Theologiques,50, pp.237-249
Jossua, J.P., (1968) *Theology in the Service of God's People,* Chicago Priory Press (translation of*Theologie au Service du People de Dieu* Paris, Cerf 1967)
Jossua, J.P., (1982) *L'Oeuvre Oecumenique du Pere Congar,* Etudes 357, 543-555
Käsemann, Ernst (1980) *Commentary on Romans,* London, SCM Press (translation of *An Die Romer*)
Kasper, Walter (1976) *Esprit, Christ, Eglise* in 'L'Experience de L'Esprit'-Melanges,E., Schillebeeckx, Paris, Beauchesne, Le Point Theologique n.18 pp. 47-69
Kasper, Walter (1974) *Jesus the Christ,* London, Burns & Oates Ltd. (translation of *Jesus der Christus,* Mainz, 1974)
Kasper, Walter (1989) *Theology and Church,* London, SCM Press, (translation of Theologie und Kirche, Mainz, Matthias-Grunewald-Verlag, 1987)

Kasper, Walter (1993) *The Church as Communio,* New Blackfriars, 74, pp. 232-251

Kern, Cyprian (1951) *En marge de l'Èpiclese*, Irenikon 24, (1951) 166-194

Lanne, D.E., (1970) *L'Église Locale et L'Église Universelle,* Irenikon XLIII, 481-511

Lauret, Bernard (1988) *Fifty Years of Catholic Theology, Conversations with Yves Congar,* London (translation of *Entretiens D'Automne,* Paris, 1987)

Leo XIII (1979 August 4) *Aeterni Patris*

Loisy, A, (1930) *Memoires pour Servir a L'Histoire Religieuse de Notre Temps,* Paris.

Lossky, V. (1957) *The Mystical Theology of the Eastern Church,* London, Clarke & Co. (translation of *Essai Sur la Théologie Mystique de L'Eglise D'Orient,* Paris, 1944)

Lossky, V. (1974) *In the Image and Likeness of God,* New York, St. Vladimir's Seminary Press

de Lubac, H. (1967) *The Mystery of the Supernatural,* London, Chapman (translation of *Le Mystère du Surnatural,* Paris, Aubier, 1965)

de Lubac, H, (1962) *Catholicism* London, Burns and Oates, (translation of *Catholicisme*, Paris, Cerf, 1947)

McBrien, Richard (1980) *Catholicism,* Minneapolis & London, Chapman

MacDonald, Charles (1982) *Church and World in the Plan of God,* Frankfurt, Verlag Peter Lang

MacDonald, Timothy, I. (1984) *The Ecclesiology of Yves Congar,* New York & London, United Press of America,

McDonnell, Kilian (1968) *Survey on Glossolalia,* Commonweal, 89, 202f

McDonnell, Kilian (1982-83) *The Determinative Doctrine of the Holy Spirit,* Theology Today 39, pp. 142-161

McDonnell, Kilian (1985) *A Trinitarian Theology of the Holy Spirit,* Theological Studies, 46, pp. 191-227

McPartlan, Paul (1993) *The Eucharist makes the Church*, Edinburgh, T.& T. Clark

Maritain, J. (1957) *Existence and the Existent,* New York, Doubleday & Co. (translation of *Traité de L'Existence et de L'Existant*)

Meyendorff, J. (1989) *New Life in Christ : Salvation in Orthodox Theology,* Theological Studies 50, pp. 481-499

Moltmann, Jurgen (1977) *The Church in the Power of the Spirit,* London, SCM Press (translation of *Kirche in Der Kraft des Geistes,* Munich, 1975)

Muhlen, Heribert (1969) *L'Esprit Dans L'Église,* Paris, Cerf, vol. I & II (translation of *Una Mystica Persona. Eine Person in Veilen Personen)*

Nichols, Aidan (1989) *Yves Congar,* London, Chapman

Nichols, Aidan (1990) *From Newman to Congar. The Idea of Doctrinal Development from the Victorians to the Second Vatican Council,* Edinburgh, T & T Clark

Nissiotis, Nikos (1967) *La Pneumatologie Écclesiologique au Service de L'Unite de L'Église,* Istina, 12, pp. 323-340

O'Connor, Edward, D. (1971) *The Pentecostal Movement in the Catholic Church,* Notre Dame, Indiana, Ave Maria Press

O'Meara, T.F. (1982) *Romantic Idealism and Roman Catholicism, Schelling and the Theologians,* Notre Dame, Indiana, University of Notre Dame Press

Osner, Maria, (1980) *L'Action du Saint Esprit Dans la Communion Écclesiale, Étude sur l'oeuvre d'Yves Congar* (Doctoral thesis, Universite des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg, Faculte du Theologie Catholique)

Pannenberg, W. (1985) *Anthropology in Theological Perspective,* Philadelphia , Westminster Press(translation of Anthropologie in theologischer Perspektive, Gottingen1983)

Perrot, C. (1973) *Prophètes et Prophétisme Dans le Nouveau Testament,* Lumiere et Vie, pp. 25-39

Philips, G., (1947) *La Grâce des Justes de L'Ancien Testament,* Ephemerides Theological Lovanienses, 23, 521-556;

Philips, G., (1948) *La Grâce des Justes de L'Ancien Testament* , Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses 24, pp. 23-58

Pope Pius XII , (1943) *Mystici Corporis* , A.A.S. 35

Prunieres, Jerome (1966) *L'Écclesiologie du Pere Congar : Oeuvre Temoin d'une Crise,* Etudes Franciscaines, 39, 253-283

Puyo, Jean (1975) *Jean Puyo Interroge le Pere Congar, Une Vie Pour la Verité,* Paris, Centurion

Rahner, Karl (1969) *Theological Investigations VI,* London, Darton Longman & Todd (translation of *Schriften zur Theologie VI)*

Rahner, Karl, (1970) *The Trinity,* London, Burns and Oates

Rahner, Karl, (1972) *The Shape of the Church to Come*, London, SPCK

Rahner, Karl (1973) *Theological Investigations X,* London , Darton, Longman & Todd (translation of *Schriften zur Theologie VII(2))*

Ranaghan, K. & D., (1969) *Catholic Pentecostals,* New York, Paulist Press

Roest-Crollins, A.A., (1978) *What is so New About Inculturation? A Concept and its Implications,* Gregorianum 59, pp. 721-738

Rosato, Philip (1968) *Between Christocentrism and Pneumocentrism : an Interpretation of Johann Adam Moehlers' Ecclesiology,* Heythrop Journal,19,pp.46-70

Rosato, Philip (1977) *Spirit Christology Ambiguity and Promise,* Theological Studies, 38, pp. 423-449

Rosato, Philip (1981) *The Spirit as Lord, The Pneumatology of Karl Barth,* Edinburgh, T & T Clark

Russell, Stoeger and Coyne,ed. (1988) *Physics, Philosophy and Theology: A Common Quest for Understanding,* Vatican City, Vatican Observatory.

Scheeben, M.J. (1947) *The Mysteries of Christianity,* New York, Herder & Herder (translation of *Die Mysterien des Christentums*)

Schillebeeckx, E., (1965) *L'Église du Christ et L'Homme D'Aujourdhui Selon Vatican II,* Le Puy, Xavier Mappus

Schillebeeckx, E., (1967) *Revelation and Theology,* London , Sheed & Ward (translation of *Révélation et Théologie,* Bruxelles, 1965)

Schillebeeckx, E., (1990) *The Human Story of God,* London, SCM Press (translation of *Mensen Als Verhaal Van God,* Baarn 1989)

Schilling, S.P., (1966) *Contemporary Continental Theologians,* London, SCM Press

Schoonenberg, P., (1977) *Spirit Christology and Logos Christology,* Bijdragen, 38, pp. 350-375

Schweizer, E., (1981) *The Holy Spirit,* London, SCM Press (translation of *Heiliger Geist* Stuttgart, Kreuz-Verlag, 1978)

Serge, Mgr., (1972) *What Separates us from the Old Catholic?* Istina 17, pp. 290-292

Sheehan, Bishop M., (1960) *Apologetics and Catholic Doctrine,* Dublin, M.H. Gill & Son Ltd.

Smulders, P., (1974) *Développement de la Christologie Dans Le Dogme et la Magistere,* Paris, Mysterium Salutis 10, pp.235-50

Suenens, Cardinal, (1978) *Ecumenism and Charismatic Renewal: Theological and Pastoral Orientations*, Ann Arbor & London, Servant Books

Swete, H.B.,(1909) *The Holy Spirit in the New Testament,* London, McMillan Co.

Therrien, V., (1976) *Le Discernement Spirituel,* Il est Vivant, 8, pp. 16-19 & 23-25

Tillard, J.M.R. (1977) *Primauté romaine*, Irenikon 50,3, pp.291-325

Tugwell, Simon (1972) *The Pentecostal Doctrine of Baptism in the Holy Spirit,* Heythrop Journal 13, pp. 268-281

Vermeil, E., (1913) *J.A. Moehler et L'École deTubingue*, Paris

Vischer, Lukas, (1987) *The Reception of the Debate on Collegiality* (in Alberigo, et al, *The Reception of Vatican II*), Washington, 1987

Yates, Roy, (1971-72) *A Re-examination of Ephesians 1, 23,* The Expository Times 83, pp.146-151

Zizioulas, John, (1985) *Being as Communion,* Darton, Longman & Todd Ltd., London

Zizioulas, John, (1991) *On Being a Person : Towards an Ontology of Personhood* in *Persons Divine and Human,* Edinburgh, T & T Clark, 1991